



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/PAWS/2016/3/3  
2 August 2017

ENGLISH ONLY

### REPORT OF THE CAPACITY-BUILDING WORKSHOP FOR THE PACIFIC REGION ON ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12

NADI, FIJI, 11-13 JULY 2016

#### INTRODUCTION

1. At its tenth meeting, in Nagoya, Japan, in October 2010, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 which contains 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets under five strategic goals (see decision X/2). Strategic Goal C on improving the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity includes also Target 11 on protected areas and Target 12 on threatened species. Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 states that “by 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes”. Aichi Biodiversity Target 12, states that “by 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained”.

2. In its decision XI/24, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties to undertake major efforts to achieve all elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Accordingly, the Executive Secretary organized a series of subregional workshops in collaboration with partner organizations, including the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the other members of the PoWPA Friends Consortium (UNEP-WCMC, Birdlife International and WWF), and with the generous financial contribution of the Governments of Germany, Japan and the Republic of Korea. The sixth in the series of workshops was for the Pacific Region and was organized in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) prior to the Pacific Round table on Protected Areas and hosted by the Government of Fiji. It was made possible with the generous financial support of the Government of Japan, through the Japan Biodiversity Fund and the Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). It was held in Nadi from 11 to 13 July 2016.

3. Background information for the workshop and the presentations, along with other workshop documents, can be found on the Convention’s web portal at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/?meeting=PAWS-2016-03>. The workshop was conducted in English. The list of participants is contained in annex I and the organization of work in annex II. The following is a summary of the proceedings of the workshop.

#### ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

4. Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity delivered an opening statement on behalf of the Executive Secretary of Convention and welcomed the participants, and the workshop was opened at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, 11 July 2016. Mr. Aminiasi Qareqare, Acting Director of Environment at the Department of Environment, Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development,

Housing and the Environment of the Government of Fiji, also delivered an opening statement and welcomed the participants on behalf of the host country.

5. Ms. Eleni Tokaduadua, Acting Director of Environment, at the Department of Environment, Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing and the Environment, was elected Chair of the meeting based on proposals from the floor. Subsequently, all participants introduced themselves briefly. The provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary ([UNEP/CBD/PAWS/2016/3/1](#)) was then adopted without amendment. The proposed organization of work, as contained in annex II, was also adopted without amendment.

6. In the first presentation of the day, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda introduced the participants to the processes that had led up to the workshop as well as the main objectives and expected outputs. Regarding the process leading up to the workshop, he mentioned the development of the programme of work on protected areas (PoWPA); the elements of PoWPA; the outcomes of the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; PoWPA successes; and the outcomes of the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties regarding protected areas. Mr. Gidda also discussed the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and summarized the findings of the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook* on the mid-term status of those two targets. He reminded the participants of all those details and then presented the Strategy of the Convention to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 by 2020. He stated the workshop objectives and expected outcomes, including the four main elements: identifying status, gaps and opportunities of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12; developing national priority actions; exploring support through national budgets, bilateral sources, the sixth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility, and the next decision on protected areas for the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, as well as exploring tools and mechanisms for implementation of transboundary conservation areas. He concluded by presenting the organization of work of the meeting and describing the content of the USB keys that were given to each participant.

7. The second presentation was made by Mr. Trevor Sandwith of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), who presented the outcomes of the most recent IUCN World Parks Congress, which had been held in Sydney, Australia, in November 2014. The aim of the World Parks Congress had been to identify how protected areas could contribute solutions to global challenges while also accelerating progress to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and goals for sustainability. He discussed four elements that had arisen from the Congress as the “[Promise of Sydney](#)”: first, in the vision, the high level aspirations for the change needed in the coming decade; second, in innovative approaches, the identification of successful approaches that could be scaled up and replicated; third, the collation of case studies and evidence of successful practice on a shared Panorama website of solutions for peer-to-peer learning and capacity development; and fourth, commitments as part of the Promise of Sydney, that signal the intention of Governments and other organizations to accelerate implementation. He stated that the Congress had emphasized the need to progress and not regress, and outlined the development of the new [IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas](#) standard as a means to measure performance against Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 qualitative parameters, to inspire a new generation of citizens who understand and support the conservation of nature; and to emphasize the solutions that nature and protected areas provide which are the foundation of sustainable development, including meeting such challenges as climate change. Mr. Sandwith concluded his presentation by summarizing the eight streams of innovative approaches and cross-cutting themes discussed at the Congress.

8. In the third presentation, Mr. Edward Lewis and Ms. Marine Deguignet of the United Nations Environment Programme’s [World Conservation Monitoring Centre](#) (UNEP-WCMC) presented on the [World Database on Protected Areas](#) (WDPA) under the Protected Planet. They gave a general review of UNEP-WCMC, Protected Planet and WDPA and the nature of their activities. WDPA was the only global authoritative database on terrestrial and marine protected areas compiled and managed by UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with Governments and non-governmental organizations. That database collects data about sites designated at the national, regional (e.g. Natura 2000) and international levels (e.g. World Heritage Site.). In terms of their activities, it was indicated that they equipped decision makers to make

enlightened choices for people and the planet by unlocking the power of data. They also collated, verified, analysed and shared information to create new knowledge for use to advocate for change and strengthen the capacity of their partners to do the same. They gave details on the main areas of work of their programme on protected areas, including: (a) WDPA; (b) [protectedplanet.net](http://protectedplanet.net); (c) systematic conservation planning; (d) Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs); (e) other effective area-based conservation measures; (f) management effectiveness; (g) Protected Areas Resilient to Climate Change (PARCC); and (h) connectivity and equity. The presentation also included a brief history of the WDPA and the evolution of the terrestrial and marine protected area network since the first World Parks Congress, in 1962. They indicated that there were 538 data sources, which presented such challenges as different definitions of protected areas, complex governance structures, and countries lacking the capacity to engage, as well as limited technical capacity. The advantages of the WDPA structure and data standards included interoperability, consistency of information, user friendly format, and WPDA-ID as a unique identifier.

9. It was further explained that, as of June 2016, the WDPA contained 229,593 records from over 244 countries and territories, and over 18,300 records had a marine component. The presentation included the proportion of sites and of area covered by protected areas in every region. At the regional level, coverage statistics varied greatly when comparing terrestrial and marine realms. In most regions, terrestrial areas were more protected than marine areas. Only in Oceania was the reverse true, as of 2014, due to the establishment of a number of very large marine sites in the last few years, including the [Natural Park of the Coral Sea](#), in New Caledonia. It was explained that 65.6 per cent of sites were found in Europe, which represented 12.9 per cent of protected areas globally, and that Oceania covered 24.2 per cent of protected areas with only 8.3 per cent of sites.

10. Protected areas were often referred to as a cornerstone of conservation efforts globally but there were also areas that conserved biodiversity but were not incorporated in the WDPA. In terms of the importance of the contribution of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), and Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs), it was indicated that 83 per cent of protected areas in the WDPA were under the control of government agencies, but that appropriate accounting of ICCAs could make a significant difference. WDPA area covered 4,740,118 sq km and OECM area covered 3,944,211 sq km. The three main challenges faced by WDPA, namely lack of updating for data, lack of capacity to deliver data, and lack of capacity to have data centrally located were discussed. The presentation then moved to the tool [Protected Planet](#), including the data it used, its content, and its usefulness for consultation and as a source of credible information for publication by different organizations, and for supporting decision-making. They indicated that their organization worked closely and continuously with countries to collect data about protected areas designated at the national level. They were present at the workshop to discuss with delegates ways to update the WDPA with national information. The status of protected areas in Pacific countries in WDPA was then presented.

11. Following their presentation, Mr. Lewis and Ms. Deguignet invited participants to express their views on the WDPA and discuss all pertinent points at the meeting. Two of the issues that were raised were that the classification of protected areas might be different from one country to another and that the numbers in the WDPA might not necessarily correspond to the official national statistics. In response, they explained that the WDPA used data from the national authority but sometimes also included multiple sources, which might explain some of the discrepancies. They stated that the information in the WDPA was sometimes outdated and that their colleagues would be pleased to update it with the help of national authorities. The WDPA team also shared experiences and engaged in dialogue with countries to address issues related to discrepancies among numbers which, at times, were the result of countries applying their own understanding of the concept of the different management categories due to the lack of a standard.

12. Mr. Mark O'Brien, Regional Programme Coordinator at BirdLife International, delivered a presentation on Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) as a support tool for implementing Aichi Target 11. The presentation included a description of the IBA Programme, the IBA global criteria and the way data was collected using global science and local expertise. It was explained that data was gathered at the local level, analysed at the national level,

assessed at the regional level, and standardized at the global level. More than 12,000 IBAs had been identified globally, and terrestrial IBAs covered approximately 7 per cent of the land surface of the world. For marine IBAs, BirdLife International had created the marine e-atlas and identified over 3,000 sites in 150 countries, and high seas covering 6.5 per cent of the oceans as marine IBAs. A relatively new tool was also presented: the Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites, which were vital sites for threatened species. To date, 587 sites covering 920 species had been identified as AZEs. Mr. O'Brien further explained that Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) were sites contributing significantly to the global continuance of biodiversity. A new global KBA standard had been approved in April 2016 and now provided the framework for KBA identification and revision by using 11 criteria grouped under five categories: (a) threatened biodiversity; (b) geographically restricted biodiversity; (c) ecological integrity; (d) biological processes; and (e) irreplaceability.

13. It was explained that, within the five regions systematically assessed to date, IBAs constituted 68 per cent of all KBAs while AZEs constituted 3 per cent. Participants were reminded that KBAs still needed better protection as only 28 per cent of all IBAs were completely covered by protected areas and 49 per cent had no protection at all. Approximately 60 per cent of the AZEs identified so far were protected, but countries should aim to have 100 per cent of their AZEs protected by 2020 to facilitate the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 and other Aichi Biodiversity Targets. There was progress in the protection of KBAs as the mean percentage of IBAs and AZEs covered by protected areas had increased over the preceding decades, but the actual proportion of protected areas covering KBAs was decreasing, as opposed to protected areas established outside of KBAs. The protection of KBAs was important, as it had been proven that the extinction risk for birds was significantly lower in better protected IBAs. Many other applications of KBAs, including informing the description of EBSAs, supporting the designation of Ramsar sites, mainstreaming biodiversity, promoting local engagement with conservation and helping in decision-making, were also presented and discussed.

14. One of the issues that arose was that organizations needed to ensure that the government was consulted when designating a site so that the government could fulfil its commitments. Participants indicated, inter alia, that a mechanism including the government during the process of designating a KBA should exist.

## **ITEM 2. COLLECTING AND SHARING INFORMATION AND DATA ON STATUS, GAPS AND OPPORTUNITIES REGARDING THE ELEMENTS OF AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12**

15. Under this item, a representative of the [Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme](#) (SPREP) gave an overview of SPREP, which had 26 members, 21 of which were Pacific island countries and territories, and the remaining 5 were developed countries (Australia, France, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America). Based in Samoa, SPREP had four strategic priorities — waste management, climate change, environmental monitoring and governance, and biodiversity and ecosystems management — along which SPREP served its member countries. The representative also talked about the framework for nature conservation and protected areas in the Pacific islands region, the guide to the linkages between Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), and the objectives of the framework for nature conservation and protected areas in the Pacific islands region, as well as natural solutions promoted by SPREP for building resilience to changing climatic and other conditions in the region.

16. The discussion then focused on the [Protected Areas Portal](#) (PIPAP), which had been developed to facilitate knowledge exchange among protected areas practitioners in the Pacific islands, i.e. a portal through which to access a wealth of information to achieve multiple objectives within international and regional targets, among others. PIPAP was described as a catalyst for the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Actions by countries included the [Pacific Oceanscape Framework](#), the [Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands Region 2014-2020](#), the [Coral Triangle Initiative on Coral Reefs, Fisheries and Food Security](#), and the [Micronesia Challenge](#), with commitments to conserve at least 30 per cent of the near-shore marine resources and 20 per cent of the terrestrial

resources across the Federated States of Micronesia by 2020. In general, SPREP members had been substantially contributing to protected areas. Information was also provided to participants on how countries could help make PIPAP an effective decision support tool, the data collation process, and the engagement of countries in terms of data collection. The “[Protect Pacific Whales–Ocean Voyagers](#)” project, including its objectives to raise awareness and build management capacity, and key related events were mentioned.

17. Mr. Michael Donoghue, Threatened and Migratory Species Adviser at SPREP, then delivered a presentation on protecting the Pacific’s threatened and migratory species. Using Pacific turtles as an example, he explained that, for critically endangered species, one criterion was greater or equal to 80-90 per cent population reduction measured over the longer of 10 years or three generations; for endangered species, one criterion was greater or equal to 50-70 per cent population reduction measured over the longer of 10 years or three generations. He indicated that turtle stocks in the Pacific Ocean had been significantly reduced for various reasons. Data regarding turtle migration, among others, was stored in the [Turtle Research and Monitoring Database System](#) (TREDS). He also talked about conservation of sharks as many were threatened and migratory and their numbers had declined significantly in the SPREP region in recent years. SPREP was the regional coordinating agency for the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Both whitetip and silky sharks were now subject to a regulation by the [Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission \(WCPFC\)](#) which required that, if caught, they should be released immediately with minimal harm.

18. The value of sharks for tourism was then explained. Shark-related tourism was worth at least US\$ 3.7 million in Belize, US\$ 5.9 million in South Africa and US\$ 42.2 million in Fiji. In that respect, four Pacific island countries (Cook Islands, Fiji, Palau and Samoa) were Parties to the [Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals](#), which, with a total of 124 contracting Parties, was intended to protect species that regularly crossed international boundaries, including sharks. Mr. Donoghue also discussed the membership of Pacific countries in the [Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora](#). He indicated that whales were sentinels of the ocean and that the impact of climate change and pollution on them would also affect humans. He explained that the main objectives of the [Pacific Islands Regional Marine Species Programme](#) and the activities of SPREP as well as the main objectives of the Year of the Whale were: (a) to celebrate whales and their place in Pacific cultures; (b) to conduct research to find out more about whales in the SPREP region; (c) to build management capacity in the region (e.g. to safely deal with stranded and entangled whales); (d) to promote best practices and whale-watching as an economic benefit for coastal communities; and (e) to reinforce the image of the Pacific islands as a region where whales were appreciated and protected.

19. Mr. Etika Qica Rupeni, Regional Project Officer at the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), then made a presentation. Among the topics discussed during that session were the [Red List of Threatened Species](#), the status in Pacific countries of Aichi Biodiversity Target 12 on threatened species, and a new tool developed by IUCN and other partner organizations called “Assisting progress towards Aichi Target 12”. He first discussed the key components of Aichi Target 12: preventing extinction and enhancing improvement in conservation status. He then presented the status of the target at the global level. That was followed by a discussion on the Red List of Threatened Species, its history, objectives, processes, and goal. That was done to provide information and results of analyses on the status, trends and threats to species in order to inform and catalyse action for biodiversity conservation. He went on to present the different categories and criteria used by that tool as well as the assessment process and the mechanisms used by IUCN to assure governance and quality control.

20. Mr. Rupeni then presented the training and capacity-building done by IUCN through assessors’ training workshops and online training courses. He also briefly talked about the national red lists compiled by countries to provide them with key information about species status within their borders. He concluded by presenting a new decision support tool, the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) country profiles. Those profiles would include peer-reviewed and robust information managed by experts

and integrated data on species, protected areas and key biodiversity areas. The objectives of the profiles and their intended audience were explained. The participants were then asked to give feedback on the use, presentation, and content of that tool. It was generally observed that that tool would indeed be useful and ease the process and the burden of reporting.

21. Following that presentation, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda of the Secretariat of the Convention delivered a presentation entitled “Subregional analysis of the status of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11”. He first provided an explanation of each of the elements of Aichi Target 11, which were: (a) quantitative elements; (b) areas important for biodiversity; (c) effective management; (d) equitable management; (e) ecological representativeness; (f) connectivity and integration into wider land- and seascapes; and (g) other effective area-based conservation measures. He also presented global, subregional and national data, as available, for each of those elements. As describing the status of all the above-mentioned elements would have taken too long, he delved into only one, quantitative elements, for illustrative purposes. For the quantitative aspects of Aichi Target 11, Mr. Gidda stated that, as in 2015, globally, 14.7 per cent of land and 10.2 per cent of coastal and marine areas up to 200 nautical miles were protected, the global objective of securing 17 per cent of terrestrial areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas as protected was close to being reached. However, he also noted that simply achieving the coverage aspect of Aichi Target 11 would not result in achieving the target overall as all of the different elements of the target had to be simultaneously achieved. He explained that obtaining quantitative information on many of those other elements was difficult due to different interpretations by Parties and a lack of available data.

22. Regarding protected area coverage in the Pacific region, at the subregional level, Mr. Gidda also explained that Polynesia had 7.6 per cent and 0.4 per cent and Melanesia and the Federated States of Micronesia together 27.1 per cent and 4.5 per cent terrestrial and marine protected areas, respectively. Nationally, Fiji had 93.3 per cent protected areas while Nauru had none, and Kiribati and Tonga 11.1 per cent and 13.5 per cent respectively. For coastal and marine areas, Fiji had 20.8 per cent, Kiribati 11.1 per cent, Tonga 2 per cent, Vanuatu 2.3 per cent and the remaining countries less than 0.5 per cent (Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) up to 200 nautical miles). He also discussed the protection status of important bird and biodiversity areas (IBAs) in the Federated States of Micronesia, Melanesia and Polynesia. In terms of the protection status of Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (AZEs), he indicated that there were 3 AZEs with no protection in the Federated States of Micronesia, 1 in Polynesia, and 14 in Melanesia; as well as 4 AZEs with partial protection in Melanesia. He then discussed the elements of targets 11 and 12, the progress of which needed to speed up to be able to attain the Targets by 2020.

23. Mr. Gidda then introduced the participants to the group exercise on national assessment of the status, gaps, and opportunities for each element of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. Participants were invited to work on the country exercise, taking into account the information that had been gathered through the questionnaire sent out to participants prior to the workshop. Participants were asked to complete the assignment and submit it on the last day of the workshop. The outcomes of the exercise are presented in annex III.

### **ITEM 3. CAPACITY-BUILDING, AWARENESS-RAISING AND INTEGRATION OF RELEVANT ISSUES ON PROTECTED AREAS**

#### **A. Governance and equity**

24. Under this item, Mr. Trevor Sandwith of IUCN gave an introduction to “governance of protected areas”. A protected area, according to IUCN, was “a clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values”.<sup>1</sup> He clearly explained the difference between management — which consisted of understanding a situation, the specific objectives to reach the goal and vision, carrying out actions to achieve them by allocating resources (human, financial), and monitoring achievement — and governance, which consisted of institutions for decision-making, dividing

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about>

responsibilities and functions, making and enforcing rules, exercising and sharing power, and deciding how to go about all that. Governance, in general, was about full participation, equity, accountability, and transparency.

25. Mr. Sandwith also explained that the two dimensions of governance of protected areas were diversity (governance type, who held authority, responsibility, accountability for the protected areas) and quality (good governance, how was that authority exercised and how fairly, effectively, accountably, and transparently was it exercised). He explained four governance types: (a) governance by government; (b) governance by private actors; (c) shared governance; and (d) governance by indigenous peoples and local communities. The question to ask to determine the governance type of a protected area was “Who holds de facto authority and responsibility for the protected area?” He went on to explain the different governance types in detail: shared governance consisted of transboundary governance (between at least two governments and other actors); collaborative governance consisted of various forms of pluralist influence on relevant decisions; and joint governance consisted of a formal pluralist management board or decision-making body with responsibility and accountability shared between governmental agencies and other stakeholders (in particular the relevant landowners and the indigenous peoples and local communities who depended on the natural resources culturally and/or for their livelihoods). He also indicated how the governance types were related to the management categories. He used the [IUCN Protected Areas Governance Matrix](#) to explain the links between the governance types and management categories. Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services were conserved in systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (i.e. protected areas defined by IUCN and recognized and reported by Governments, and other areas.) He concluded by indicating that conserving nature had to be an objective, and protected areas had to be effectively managed and governed.

26. Mr. Sandwith then presented “governance quality for protected areas” to explain the importance of understanding governance of protected areas. He first stated that conservation around the world was changing in many ways; it was a movement that had been building up for years among different stakeholders and had been enshrined in international policy decisions. He then presented the needs for achieving conservation objectives: (a) the need to take into account the capacities, concerns and engagement of society as a whole; (b) the need to pay more attention to the crucial ties between biological and cultural diversity; (c) the need to allow indigenous peoples and local communities to be empowered; (d) the need for fair sharing of the costs and benefits of conserving biodiversity and managing natural resources in a sustainable way; and (e) the need to respect human rights and indigenous peoples’ rights. Mr. Sandwith then described the different principles of “good governance”, namely legitimacy and voice, direction, performance, accountability, and fairness and rights. He also presented the reasons to promote quality of governance of protected areas, namely to improve management effectiveness, to involve more stakeholders, to improve social acceptance, and to improve equity. He additionally described the differences between governance assessment, evaluation, and the action process, and presented the four phases for realizing them. He then explained those phases in detail and provided tools for realizing a spatial analysis, a quality assessment, and an evaluation of governance. He concluded his presentation by describing the possible results of an assessment at the system level and the possible outcomes of a governance evaluation. He explained that, by taking one area, quality could be determined by asking questions such as: what issues have arisen in the protected area? How were they dealt with? What has been the result?

27. Mr. Sandwith explained that conservation-related activities needed to take greater account of the crucial ties between biological and cultural diversity and of the conditions that allowed indigenous peoples and local communities to be empowered for conservation, among others. Conservation needed equity: (a) fair sharing of the costs and benefits of conserving biodiversity and managing natural resources in a sustainable way; (b) respecting human rights and indigenous peoples’ rights; and (c) avoiding harm and having a positive impact on livelihoods. Quality relied on principles of good governance, which consisted, as IUCN recognized, of direction, performance, accountability, legitimacy and voice, and fairness and rights. He also explained that the first three principles (including strategic

vision, responsiveness, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability and transparency) were about effective governance and the last two (including participation, consensus orientation, equity, rule of law) about equitable governance.

28. Mr. Sandwith also discussed details on assessing and evaluating protected area governance, and improving the process for taking action. He highlighted four phases to that process. He also gave examples of the steps involved including legal, spatial, governance quality analyses, evaluating a system of protected areas and reporting actions (such as a governance assessment and an evaluation report to the Secretariat of the Convention and PoWPA), and governance action plan to address issues at site level. He discussed fairness, which had to do with inclusion, equity and justice, and the three dimensions of equity, which consisted of recognition, procedure and distribution, and how enabling conditions were established. He illustrated and explained how they were interlinked and showed how governance and social assessments were done to assess equity. He also engaged participants by asking them to identify priority actions for the protected areas in their country to enhance the quality of governance of protected areas, including enhancing equity.

29. Following his presentation, Mr. Sandwith engaged participants in a discussion on governance of protected areas by inviting them to share their experiences and asking them the following questions: Have you conducted an assessment of the governance of the whole system of protected areas in your country? Are the provisions for good governance sufficient in your overall protected areas system? Have you instituted legal reforms to address issues of governance? What are the opportunities to address issues where there may be room to enhance the quality of governance? In response to issues raised by the participants, Mr. Sandwith stated that, to avoid problems, it was important that members of communities knew about a project before it started, and what the benefit would be to avoid problems.

30. The reason governance was being discussed at the workshop was the expression “effectively and equitably managed” contained in Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. The term “governance” could be defined by emphasizing key questions when trying to assess the governance type of a protected area: Who has influence? Who decides? Who is accountable? Participants were encouraged to look at their protected areas through a “governance” lens. The numerous differences between governance and management were explained, and countries were encouraged to aim at having not only effectively managed protected areas but also protected areas with “good governance”. In general, the history of the international policy responses on protected areas governance was long even from the IUCN World Parks Congress in 2003, to the creation of PoWPA in 2004, to the IUCN World Parks Congress in 2014. PoWPA Programme Element 2 was also related to governance, participation, equity and benefit-sharing.

31. Ms. Lea M. Scherl, International Consultant with the GEF-PAS Project on Forestry Conservation and Protected Area Management in Fiji, James Cook University, delivered a presentation on the contributions of marine protected areas to poverty reduction. She referred to marine protected areas (MPAs) as nature’s investment bank. She first discussed poverty focal areas. She presented the results of the evaluation of four marine protected areas and how clearly they contributed to poverty reduction in relatively different dimensions. The contribution to poverty reduction came from increased fish catches, new jobs, better local governance, benefits to health, benefits to women, more social cohesion, and revival of traditional customs and values. For example, findings for Arnavon and Solomon Islands included: (a) better local governance resulting in more links among dispersed communities from different cultural backgrounds; (b) new jobs in seaweed farming and in the MPA (more power to different sectors of the community); (c) cultural traditions revived (e.g. listening to the chief); and (d) better health due to a more diversified diet and the use of the MPA boat as an ambulance. Success factors from the MPAs Poverty Reduction Study included: local management or co-management of marine resources; new income activities to ensure that local communities benefited tangibly in the short term and diversified influence within the community; and benefits to women and youth.

32. Mr. Sandwith then continued his presentation by stating that there were many similarities between the different interventions from countries, mainly about the importance of the participation of local communities in the decision-making processes and the importance of sharing benefits with those

communities. He also stated that it was quite easy to improve the governance of a protected area in theory, but it was quite difficult in reality to put in place principles of good governance. He finished his presentation by presenting briefly the difference between inclusion, equity, justice and fairness, which included the first three terms. “Equity” was the term widely used by the Convention on Biological Diversity and in the Sustainable Development Goals. Equity had three dimensions, namely recognition, procedure and distribution, and a governance assessment would help in assessing the dimension of recognition and procedure, while a social assessment would help in assessing the dimension of distribution.

### **B. Protected areas in national biodiversity strategies and action plans and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development**

33. In that context, Mr. Gidda made a presentation on the importance of NBSAPs and their alignment including with the PoWPA and the Sustainable Development Goals. He mentioned decision XI/24, in which the Conference of the Parties had invited Parties to integrate PoWPA action plans into updated NBSAPs, to renew efforts to establish multisectoral committees that included representatives of indigenous and local communities in support of PoWPA, to undertake major efforts to achieve all elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, and to align protected area projects in PoWPA action plans with relevant replenishments of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and with the Sustainable Development Goals, among others. He gave the list of Pacific countries that had submitted their fifth national report and PoWPA Action Plan. He informed the participants that, since 2012, over 100 PoWPA action plans had been submitted and made available at: [www.cbd.int/protected/implementation/actionplans](http://www.cbd.int/protected/implementation/actionplans).

34. Mr. Gidda then explained the linkages between Target 11 and other Aichi Targets. The status of Target 11, as indicated in fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*, and the implications of implementation of national priority actions, developed by Parties to achieve Target 11 by 2020, were then discussed, and the prospect of achieving each of the elements of Target 11, and even surpassing some of them, was found to be very high. He went on to explain that the achievement of Target 11 would contribute, inter alia, to other Aichi Targets, many Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,<sup>2</sup> climate change mitigation and adaptation (relevant articles of the [Paris Agreement](#)), synergistic implementation of requirements in other multilateral environmental agreements, international plans and programmes and disaster risk reduction plans.

35. Mr. Gidda also presented details on the relevant Sustainable Development Goals and targets, explained the linkages with Target 11, and reiterated that the implementation of national priority actions and the achievement of Target 11 would contribute, inter alia, to Sustainable Development Goals 6.6, 13.1, 14.5, 15.1, 15.2 and 15.5 directly and 1.2, 12.2, 13.a and b, 15.7, and 15.8 indirectly, through the goods and services provided by protected areas. Overall, the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 would generate multiple benefits for the well-being of society by contributing solutions to the most important global challenges, such as food/water security, health, and the impacts of climate change, and by facilitating sustainable development of nations (including poverty eradication and economic prosperity) and life in harmony with nature, at the local, national and global levels.

### **C. Global Environment Facility funding, including the development of project identification forms**

36. Under this item, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda engaged the audience in a presentation on the Global Environment Facility (GEF). He began by discussing the history of GEF and what its individual or national entitlements were. He discussed the structure of the GEF allocations, explaining that 32 per cent or US\$ 1.2 billion was allocated for biodiversity. He reviewed the information presented in the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 country dossiers regarding GEF funding allocation per country, and the categories under which they could access funding. For the biodiversity allocation, he gave the breakdown of entitlements for the System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (STAR), sustainable forest

---

<sup>2</sup> See [General Assembly resolution 70/1](#), entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”.

management, and other allocations. A total of 6 out of 10 programmes for funding under GEF were related to elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. He discussed the amount to which each country was entitled, what the fund could be used for, and how the fund could be accessed. He informed participants that, in order to access funding, countries needed: (a) to take into consideration national priorities through a prioritization workshop; (b) to decide which funding allocations should be used and which implementing agency was best to approach; and (c) to develop the project identification form (PIF). He gave participants some key take-home messages, including involvement in the revision of NBSAPs ensuring that actions related to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 were included in the revised strategies, contacting CBD and GEF operational focal points and the GEF implementing agencies, becoming involved in prioritization workshops, submitting projects under STAR, and visiting the GEF website.

#### **ITEM 4. INPUTS TO THE THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION**

##### **A. Identifying focused actions towards the achievement of priority elements of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12**

37. Under this item, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda delivered a presentation entitled “Priority actions” in which he recapitulated national commitments as per decision XI/24 of the Conference of the Parties and summarized the process of formulating actions for the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. He stated that, in that process, country experts would look at existing national commitments for Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 to be achieved by 2020, as per their revised NBSAP, PoWPA action plan or other national protected area planning document; they would also assess, through a matrix, the status of commitments for current projects, such as bilaterally funded and GEF-5 projects, as they related to the nine elements of the two targets. Country experts would then determine if there was a gap between what they had committed to achieving by 2020 and what they had currently done in projects, and, lastly, given a gap, they would evaluate opportunities and develop national priority actions to ensure the full implementation of national commitments. Those national priority actions should be undertaken in the next four years and their implementation should improve the existing status of the elements of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 by 2020 at the national, regional or global levels.

38. Mr. Gidda further discussed the current situation in terms of the quantitative elements and coverage of ecological regions. He indicated that, given the current status, what was needed in order to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 was already known. There was a need to explore what could be achieved given the timeline and based on clear understanding of the goal. He then emphasized the importance of not repeating the past error of setting unrealistic targets, but instead, to set clear goals and actions in view of the priorities and the time period for implementation. There was a tendency to seek quantitative objectives, but, without quality, quantity had no meaning. Thus, both kinds of actions were needed. He concluded by stating that, once goals were set, a very sincere and focused attempt to reach them had to be made.

39. Subsequently, participants were invited to complete their priority actions list with the support of their colleagues through peer-to-peer exchange of information. On the last day of the workshop, in a session moderated by Mr. Trevor Sandwith of IUCN, each country presented briefly one or two of their priority actions. The outcomes of that exercise are presented in annex III.

##### **B. Discussion on needs for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12**

40. Under this item, Mr. Trevor Sandwith of IUCN facilitated a group exercise and discussion on formulating practical elements for a decision of the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting that would help in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. The outcome of that exercise is presented in annex IV.

**ITEM 5. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

41. Under this item, Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda delivered closing remarks and Ms. Eleni Tokaduadua, the Chair of the workshop, gave a summary of the proceedings. Lastly, a workshop evaluation was carried out, and the workshop was closed at 4:30 p.m. on Wednesday, 13 July 2016.

*Annex I***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****Fiji**

1. Ms. Sarah Tawaka  
Senior Environment Officer  
Resource Management Unit  
Ministry of Local Government, Urban  
Development, Housing and the Environment  
E-mail: [sarah.tawaka@govnet.gov.fj](mailto:sarah.tawaka@govnet.gov.fj)
2. Mr. Aminiasi Qareqare  
Acting Director of Environment  
Department of Environment – Fiji Island  
E-mail:  
[aminiasi.qareqare@environment.gov.fj](mailto:aminiasi.qareqare@environment.gov.fj)
3. Mr. Lote Rusaqoli  
Senior Environment Officer  
Department of Environment – Fiji Island  
E-mail: [lote.rusaqoli@environment.gov.fj](mailto:lote.rusaqoli@environment.gov.fj)
4. Mr. Viliame Momoivalu  
Acting Senior Environment Officer  
Department of Environment – Fiji Island  
E-mail:  
[viliame.momoivalu@environment.gov.fj](mailto:viliame.momoivalu@environment.gov.fj)
5. Ms. Senivasa Waqairamasi  
Senior Environment Officer  
E-mail:  
[senivasa.waqairamasi@environment.gov.fj](mailto:senivasa.waqairamasi@environment.gov.fj)
6. Mr. Manasa Luvunakoro  
Principal Forestry Training Centre  
Ministry of Local Government, Urban  
Development, Housing and the Environment  
E-mail: [manasa.luvunakoro@govnet.gov.fj](mailto:manasa.luvunakoro@govnet.gov.fj)
7. Mr Ilaisa Tulele  
National Project Coordinator  
Forest and Protected Area Management  
Project Fiji  
E-mail: [tulele.ilai@live.com](mailto:tulele.ilai@live.com)
8. Ms. Eleni Rova Marama Tokaduadua  
Acting Director of Environment  
Department of Environment  
Ministry of Local Government, Urban  
Development, Housing and the Environment  
E-mail: [etokaduadua@gmail.com](mailto:etokaduadua@gmail.com);  
[eleni.tokaduadua@govnet.gov.fj](mailto:eleni.tokaduadua@govnet.gov.fj)
9. Ms Elizabeth Erasito  
Director  
National Trust of Fiji  
E-mail: [eerasito@nationaltrust.org.fj](mailto:eerasito@nationaltrust.org.fj)

**Kiribati**

10. Mr. George Taoaba  
Biodiversity and Conservation Officer  
Environment and Conservation Division  
Ministry of Environment, Lands and  
Agricultural Development  
E-mail: [georget@environment.gov.ki](mailto:georget@environment.gov.ki)

**Marshall Islands**

11. Mr. Broderick Menke  
Reimaanlok Projects Specialist  
Marshall Islands Conservation Society  
Majuro, Marshall Islands  
E-mail: [bmenke@cmi.edu](mailto:bmenke@cmi.edu)

**Micronesia (Federated States of)**

12. Mr. Eugene Joseph  
Executive Director  
Conservation Society of Pohnpei  
Kolonias, Pohnpei, FM  
E-mail: [euoseph925@gmail.com](mailto:euoseph925@gmail.com);  
[cspdirector@serehd.org](mailto:cspdirector@serehd.org)  
cc: [alissa.takesy@fsmrd.fm](mailto:alissa.takesy@fsmrd.fm)

**Nauru**

13. Mrs. Mavis Depaune  
Environmental Advisor  
E-mail: [monmave@gmail.com](mailto:monmave@gmail.com)

**Niue**

14. Mr. Logopati Seumanu  
National Project Coordinator  
Department of Environment  
Ministry of Natural Resources  
E-mail: [logo.seumanu@mail.gov.nu](mailto:logo.seumanu@mail.gov.nu)

**Palau**

15. Ms. Gwendalyn Sisor  
Senior Projects Manager  
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment  
and Tourism  
2nd Floor, Executive Building  
Ngerulmud, PW 96940  
E-mail: [gsisor07@gmail.com](mailto:gsisor07@gmail.com)

**Papua New Guinea**

16. Ms. Rose Waigl Alphonse  
Policy Analyst  
Sustainable Policy and International  
Branch Conservation and Environment  
Protection Authority  
National Capital District, Papua New  
Guinea  
E-mail: [ralphonse@dec.gov.pg](mailto:ralphonse@dec.gov.pg);  
[rwalphonse@gmail.com](mailto:rwalphonse@gmail.com)

**Samoa**

17. Mr. Tumutalie Foliga  
Principal Parks and Reservation Officers  
Parks and Reserves, Division of  
Environment and Conservation  
Ministry of Natural Resources and  
Environment  
E-mail: [talie.foliga@mnre.gov.ws](mailto:talie.foliga@mnre.gov.ws)

**Solomon Islands**

18. Ms. Agnetha Vave-Karamui  
Chief Conservation Officer  
Environment and Conservation Division  
Ministry of Environment, Climate Change,  
Disaster Management and Meteorology  
E-mail: [agnetha.vavekaramui@gmail.com](mailto:agnetha.vavekaramui@gmail.com)

**Tonga**

19. Ms. Dorothy Foliaki  
Senior Biodiversity Officer  
Department of Environment  
Ministry of Meteorology, Energy,  
Information, Disaster Management,  
Environment, Climate Change and  
Communications  
E-mail: [eritakwan@gmail.com](mailto:eritakwan@gmail.com)

**Tuvalu**

20. Mr. Faoliu Teakau  
Acting Biodiversity Officer  
Department of Environment  
E-mail: [fteakau@gmail.com](mailto:fteakau@gmail.com)

**Vanuatu**

21. Ms. Donna Tounapanga Kalfatak  
Senior Biodiversity Officer  
Department of Environmental Protection  
and Conservation  
E-mail: [dkalfatak@vanuatu.gov.vu](mailto:dkalfatak@vanuatu.gov.vu) or  
[dkmoli@gmail.com](mailto:dkmoli@gmail.com)

**Indigenous and Local Community – Solomon Islands**

22. Mr. Allan Tippet Bero  
Operations Manager  
Tetepare Descendants' Association  
Tetepare Island Biodiversity Conservation  
Programme  
E-mail: [tetepare@solomon.com.sb](mailto:tetepare@solomon.com.sb)

**United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues - New Zealand**

23. Ms. Valmaine Marie Mabel Toki  
Expert Member  
United Nations Permanent Forum on  
Indigenous Issues  
E-mail: [valmaine@waikato.ac.nz](mailto:valmaine@waikato.ac.nz)

**International Union for Conservation of Nature**

24. Mr. Trevor Sandwith  
Director Global Protected Areas  
International Union for the Conservation of  
Nature  
Gland, Switzerland  
E-mail: [trevor.sandwith@iucn.org](mailto:trevor.sandwith@iucn.org)

**Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme**

25. Ms. Easter Galuvao  
Biodiversity Adviser  
E-mail: [easterg@sprep.org](mailto:easterg@sprep.org)  
Resource Person
26. Ms. Amanda Wheatley  
Ecosystem and Biodiversity Officer  
P.O. Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
E-mail: [amandaw@sprep.org](mailto:amandaw@sprep.org)
27. Mr. John Sidle  
Pacific Islands Protected Area Adviser  
P.O. Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
E-mail: [johns@sprep.org](mailto:johns@sprep.org)
28. Mr. Michael Donoghue  
Threatened and Migratory Species Adviser  
P.O. Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
E-mail: [michaeld@sprep.org](mailto:michaeld@sprep.org)
29. Mr. Warren Lee Long  
Coastal Management Adviser  
P.O. Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
E-mail: [warren@sprep.org](mailto:warren@sprep.org)
30. Ms. Juney Ward  
Sharks and Rays Officer  
P.O. Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
E-mail: [juney.ward@sprep.org](mailto:juney.ward@sprep.org)

### **Wildlife Conservation Society - Fiji**

31. Ms. Sangeeta Mangubhai  
Director, Wildlife Conservation Society Fiji  
11 Ma'afu Street, Suva, Fiji  
Tel.: (679) 3315174;  
E-mail: [smangubhai@wcs.org](mailto:smangubhai@wcs.org)
32. Mr. Tony O'Keeffe  
BIOPAMA Coordinator  
5 Ma'afu Street, Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji  
Tel.: +(679) 3319084  
E-mail: [tony.okeeffe@iucn.org](mailto:tony.okeeffe@iucn.org)

### **Conservation International**

33. Ms. Susana Tuisese  
Country Director–Fiji  
E-mail: [tuisese@conservation.org](mailto:tuisese@conservation.org)

### **Birdlife International**

34. Dr. Mark O'Brien  
Regional Programme Coordinator  
E-mail: [mark.obrien@birdlife.org](mailto:mark.obrien@birdlife.org)

### **Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme – Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Programme**

35. Ms. Anama Solofa  
BIOPAMA Project Officer  
Apia, Samoa  
E-mail: [anamas@sprep.org](mailto:anamas@sprep.org)

### **International Union for Conservation of Nature**

36. Mr. Etika Qica Rupeni  
Regional Project Officer  
E-mail: [etika.qica@iucn.org](mailto:etika.qica@iucn.org)

### **United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation and Monitoring Centre**

37. Ms. Marine Deguignet  
Assistant Programme Officer | Protected  
Areas  
E-mail: [marine.deguignet@unep-wcmc.org](mailto:marine.deguignet@unep-wcmc.org)

38. Mr. Edward Lewis  
Assistant Programme Officer – Protected  
Areas  
E-mail: [Edward.Lewis@unep-wcmc.org](mailto:Edward.Lewis@unep-wcmc.org)

### **Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

39. Mr. Rudolf Hahn  
FAO Chief Technical Adviser (CTA)  
GEF-PAS Forestry Conservation and  
Protected Area Management in Fiji, Samoa,  
Vanuatu and Niue  
E-mail: [Rudolf.Hahn@fao.org](mailto:Rudolf.Hahn@fao.org)

### **James Cook University**

40. Dr. Lea M. Scherl  
International Consultant with GEF-PAS  
Project on Forestry Conservation and  
Protected Area Management in Fiji, Samoa,  
Vanuatu and Niue  
E-mail: [lea.scherl@bigpond.com](mailto:lea.scherl@bigpond.com)

### **Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit**

41. Dr. Jan H. Steffen, Project Director  
Marine and Coastal Biodiversity  
Management in Pacific Island Countries –  
MACBIO  
E-mail: [jan.steffen@giz.de](mailto:jan.steffen@giz.de)

### **Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity**

42. Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda  
Programme Officer  
Conservation and Sustainable Use Unit  
Scientific and Policy Support Division  
E-mail: [sarat.gidda@cbd.int](mailto:sarat.gidda@cbd.int)
43. Mr. Marc Attallah  
Individual Contractor  
Conservation and Sustainable Use Unit  
Scientific and Policy Support Division  
E-mail: [marc.attallah@cbd.int](mailto:marc.attallah@cbd.int)

## Annex II

## ORZANIZATION OF WORK

<i>Time</i>	<i>Monday, 11 July</i>	<i>Tuesday, 12 July</i>	<i>Wednesday, 13 July</i>
9 -10:30 a.m.	<p><b>Item 1. Opening of the meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome remarks</li> <li>Election of chair</li> <li>Adoption of the agenda and organization of work</li> <li>Introduction to the workshop, SCBD</li> </ul>	<p><i>Recap of previous day</i> -----</p> <p><b>Item 2(e). Governance and Equity</b></p> <p>Presentations Group work</p>	<p><i>Recap of previous day</i> -----</p> <p><b>Item 4(a). Focused actions for implementation</b></p> <p>Group work Identification of actions</p>
10:30 - 10:45 a.m.	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>
10:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	<p><b>Presentations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promise of Sydney, IUCN</li> <li>UNEP-WCMC</li> <li>BIOPAMA</li> <li>Birdlife International (TBD)</li> <li>Subregional analysis: Target 11 , SCBD</li> </ul>	<p><b>Item 2(e). Governance and equity</b></p> <p>Group work (<i>continued</i>)</p>	<p><b>Report back</b></p> <p>Each country will present one action</p>
12:30 - 1:30 p.m.	<i>Lunch break</i>	<i>Lunch break</i>	<i>Lunch break</i>
1:30 - 3 p.m.	<p><b>Item 2. Status of targets</b></p> <p><b>Presentations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subregional analysis: Target 12, SCBD</li> </ul> <p><b>Item 2. Status of targets</b></p> <p><b>Group work</b></p>	<p><b>Item 2(e). Governance and equity</b></p> <p><b>Report back</b></p> <p>Report for each subregional group</p>	<p><b>Item 4. Inputs to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties</b></p> <p><b>Group work</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on needs for achieving Targets 11 and 12</li> </ul>
3 - 3:15 p.m.	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>	<i>Break</i>
3:15 - 5 p.m.	<p><b>Item 2. Status of targets</b></p> <p><b>Group work</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status, gaps and opportunities for Targets 11 and 12</li> </ul> <p><b>Report back</b></p> <p>Report for each subregional group</p>	<p><b>Item 4(a). Focused actions for implementation</b></p> <p><b>Presentations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NBSAPs and the Post-2015 development agenda</li> <li>GEF-6 funding</li> <li>Closing the gap for commitments: Areas of action</li> </ul>	<p><b>Item 5. Closure of the meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final remarks</li> <li>Adoption of the workshop report</li> <li>Workshop evaluation</li> </ul>

*Annex III*

**DRAFT COUNTRY TABLES OF THE STATUS, GAPS AND OPPORTUNITIES AND IDENTIFIED DRAFT NATIONAL PRIORITY ACTIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12 IN THE NEXT FOUR YEARS**

**1. Fiji**

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
<p>Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine</p>	<p>2.7% (493 sq km) of Terrestrial spaces secured.</p> <p>451 LMMA sites in Fiji (covering 78.2% (23,000 sq.km of inshore areas of which) including 425 closures mostly tabu and permanently closed. 16.6% of area under some form of management are effectively managed</p>	<p><b>Terrestrial:</b> 14.3 % (2613sq km) does not include community and voluntary PA which is not legally recognized.</p> <p><b>Marine:</b> If priority is 100% effective management, <u>in-shore gap: is 30,000 sq.km</u> <u>Offshore gap: 100,000 sq.km</u> For 10% target under Aichi target Fiji has achieved this with 16.6% under effective management If priority is 100% inshore protection; inshore gap is 30,000sqkm and offshore gap is 360,000 sq.km Absence of a Policy framework to support PA. Current legislative instruments do not support establishment of Protected areas.</p>	<p>Terrestrial : document key features of each KBA/IBA/AZE identified in the Priority PA</p> <p>Process in place to declare 2 -3 offshore marine protected areas (Offshore Fisheries Management Decree), in the Vatu-i-ra Seascape, Lau seascape and Great Sea Reef. Fisheries Department formally gazetted shark reefs and is looking at 4 more to be gazette under Section 9 of the Fisheries Act. Preliminary work in place to support Lau Seascape with the aim of establishing terrestrial and marine PA 30% is government commitment under SIDs for marine protection. PA priority maps (terrestrial and marine) reflected in the national development plan.</p>	<p>Policy and Legislation (legal review) for Protected Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cabinet policy update</li> <li>• Legislation review for both terrestrial and marine to be complete.</li> </ul> <p>Develop typology for terrestrial PA Document process/procedure needed to declare PA</p> <p>Consolidation and updating of marine priority and protected areas.</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Ecological representativeness	Priority maps are available for terrestrial and being updated for marine.	<p>Terrestrial Priority Area Map (TPAM) identified and mapped through prioritization assessment but sites need to be legally secured for PA</p> <p>Absence of a map showing priority areas for Marine MPA</p> <p>Community consultation needed to secure all areas with the proposed PA</p>	<p>Review list of sites of national significance to identify and incorporate all areas where PA are voluntary set up by communities</p> <p>Terrestrial – need to develop typology for PA</p> <p>Marine priority workshop 19 – 20 July 2016.</p> <p>Finalized and validated map for terrestrial and marine to be endorsed by Cabinet</p> <p>Use “INVEST” for eco-region integrated planning on landscape/seascape.</p>	<p>Consultant to review list, verify validity</p> <p>Terrestrial National Typology workshop for Finalization of Marine Priority maps.</p> <p>Cabinet approval for map of priority PA site for both terrestrial and marine</p> <p>Eco-regional integrated planning.</p>
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	See above.	<p>See above.</p> <p>Check list for areas of important diversity</p> <p>Check list for areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Develop a check list for areas of important diversity to verify PA listed in Sites of National Significance</p> <p>Review sites of national significant in view of recent scientific studies.</p> <p>EBSA review.</p> <p>NBSAP review and align to Target 11 and 12 of Aichi Target.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Review of NBSAP.</p> <p>Review of Ecological, Biological Significant Areas.</p>
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p> <p>Improvement(s)</p>	<p>16.6% (3894 sq km) of current inshore LMMAs confirmed as effective.</p> <p>METT has been applied to small sample sites (3) that were part of the CEPF project.</p>	<p>Absence of developed evaluation and monitoring framework for Protected Area systems.</p> <p>Baseline data is lacking for most protected areas (both marine and terrestrial).</p>	<p>METT has proven effective in 3 demonstration sites with opportunity to develop national standard METT</p> <p>Marine and Terrestrial Monitoring framework have been incorporated in GEF 6 Biodiversity PIF.</p>	<p>Replication of METT to other small sites.</p> <p>Implementation of GEF 6 Marine PA related project.</p>
Governance and equity	<p>83% of Fiji’s landmass belongs to iTaukei landowners.</p> <p>Marine Areas from high-tide water mark belong to</p>	<p>Incentive for iTaukei landowners to protect PA</p> <p>Lack of standardized governance mechanism to</p>	<p>Communicate PA priority systems to other core resource base sectors</p> <p>Work in progress for MPA costing and financing.</p> <p>Opportunity under GEF 4 for</p>	<p>National workshop for Govt. Department (Lands, Minerals, Agriculture, Town and Country Planning, Health, Education etc.) to</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
	<p>Government. Government provides access rights to local communities for food security</p> <p>Conservation lease (e.g. Rivers Fiji, Sovi Basin PA, and current work towards Kilaka Forest).</p> <p>Sustainable financing mechanisms to support Namena reserve and Vatu-i-Ra conservation park.</p>	<p>coordinate FPIC and secure support</p> <p>Lack of sustainable financing mechanisms to support long-term management of protected areas (PAs).</p>	<p>assessment of costing and financing mechanisms for terrestrial PAs.</p> <p>Opportunity for private sector involvement and engagement in PA investment.</p> <p>Replication of Sovi Basin model to other sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work in progress (Conservation lease and sustainable financing mechanisms) on other sites e.g., Greater Tomanivi, Greater Delaikoro, Greater Taveuni, Kilaka</li> </ul> <p>Opportunity for identification of Biodiversity sustainable financing sources (BIOFIN).</p>	<p>acknowledge and approve priority sites of PA for both terrestrial and marine</p> <p>Endorsement by Protected Area Committee / Government for recommendation to NEC and Cabinet</p> <p>Assessment of the Sovi Basin Trust Fund Instruments for opportunities to host financing for other PA.</p> <p>Costing of the NBSAP to understand how much money is needed to meet Aichi Target 11 and 12.</p>
Connectivity and corridors	<p>Spatial Maps have been created for Terrestrial and is underway for Marine.</p> <p>This has used connectivity at Corridors as one of its selection criteria.</p>	Lack of Scientific Information on key species and habitats.	Apply best practice guidelines to incorporate connectivity in Protected Area network, (Terrestrial and Marine).	Incorporate principles of connectivity into marine PA prioritization.
Integration into wider land and seascapes	<p>Integrated Coastal Management Framework available.</p> <p>ICM plans developed for Ra, Kadavu, Bua and Macuata.</p> <p>National ICM committee is active to oversee the development and implementation of ICM plans.</p> <p>National ICM roadmaps developed and currently awaiting ICM, NEC and Cabinet approval.</p>	Integration of ICM into the broader marine and seascape and terrestrial landscape.	<p>Secured funding through RESCUEE for Kadavu and Ra.</p> <p>Ridge to Reef (Country level – Hills to the Ocean) opportunity.</p>	<p>Tabling of National ICM roadmaps in the next ICM committee meeting.</p> <p>Integration of ICM into the broader marine and seascape and terrestrial land scape.</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Other effective area-based conservation measures	Small community-based conservation efforts e.g. Natewa, Nabu	Legal framework Criteria for effectiveness	Large existing network, how can we measure effectiveness?	Get recognition by IUCN and CBD on other effective area based management do that Fiji can report against. Ensure small community-based conservation is included in the review of PA Policy and legislation.
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	36 critically endangered IUCN species of which 30 are on the EPS Act. 5 recovery plans for iguana, Fiji Colar Petrel, sago palm, red throated lorikeet, Acropyte.	31 recovery plans. Identify common names for species under the EPS Act. Lack of communication and awareness on critically endangered species.	NDF under CITES can provide the information for 30 species in the EPS Act.	31 recovery plans to be developed.  Develop communication and awareness tools/materials for critically endangered species.
Conservation status of species in declined is improved	Assessment Process established to identify species recovery milestone for all CR species. Acropyte up to 9 colonies has improved conservation status. Crested iguana well protected in Yadua Taba.	Collation and compilation of information. Data scattered needs collating and synthesizing.	An opportunity to collate and pull data under one roof (database) e.g. NRI	Develop a national database.
<p><b>Area Focused: Baseline, how much area is 17% of terrestrial commitment and 10% of marine PA commitment in Fiji.</b></p> <p><b>Gaps: Baseline – Status</b></p> <p><b>Total EEZ = 1.3million sq.km, Inshore = 30,000 sq.km, Offshore = 1,270,000 sq.km</b>  <b>10% marine 1.3million sq.km =130,000 sq.km, Inshore = 3,000 sq.km, Offshore = 127,000 sq.km</b>  <b>30% of 1.3million sq.km = 390,000 sq.km, Inshore = 9,000 sq.km, Offshore = 381,000 sq.km</b></p> <p><b>Inshore (LMMA) 78.27% = 23,000 sq.km under some kind of management, 16.6% of LMMA sites effectively managed (already surpassing 10% requirement of inshore, as such can be added to make up for the offshore target), effectiveness gap 13.4% to meet 10%.</b></p> <p><b>Offshore target 126,105.64 sq.km needed to meet Aichi 10% target.</b></p> <p><b>If priority is 100% (FLMMA) effective protection inshore (10%) = 30,000 sq.km, Offshore = 100,000 sq.km</b></p> <p><b>If priority is 100% effective inshore protection (30%), Inshore = 30,000 sq.km, Offshore = 360,000 sq.km</b></p>				

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
	Identify area in square km/hectares currently protected.	Difference in the area to address.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GEF PIFs</li> <li>- PA maps</li> <li>- Other projects being implemented (seascapes)</li> <li>- Unreported/small scale terrestrial PAs.</li> </ul>	

## 2. Kiribati

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	<p>Marine biodiversity have exceeded that of Aichi Target 11 by 12% (to be confirmed)</p> <p>The terrestrial element have also exceeded that of the Aichi target as stated for 22% (to be confirmed)</p>	All data are not well centralized	through other government ministry and project implemented	Mapping biodiversity areas such as terrestrial plant species, marine habitats and substrate distribution
Ecological representativeness	There are existing conservation areas and reserves in Kiribati that are administered under the Fisheries Division, Environment and Conservation Division and Wildlife Unit of Environment and Conservation Division. Kiribati has also established a system of marine protected areas that aim to conserve marine biological diversity. These areas also serve as ecologically representative networks of protected areas at sea	<p>Other areas have been identified to be key biodiversity areas and important bird areas these might not be fully reflected in the existing conservation areas.</p> <p>Prioritization of Habitats and ecosystems to inform more representative network of protected areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fisheries policy</li> <li>- NBSAP revision</li> </ul>	<p>Identification of the most vulnerable areas for possible/best protections measures (buibui, mangrove planting)</p> <p>Undertake survey to determine change in shoreline</p> <p>Construct soft measures (coastal vegetation, mangroves, buibui) for coastal protection on specific islands or sites</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Areas important for biodiversity  Areas important for ecosystem services	Eight of the Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) are currently managed as Protected Areas (PAs) within the Phoenix Island Protected Area (PIPA) along with Kiritimati has an important breeding area for sea birds in the Pacific.		- Phoenix Island Protected Area trust fund	Initial PA implementation on the KBA islands with strongest support from the local island government for co-management
Management effectiveness assessment(s)  Improvement(s)	Community based management is in place and ongoing with the support of government to have community empowerment.	Assessment is poorly executed.	- Revised NBSAP	Strengthen the role of CBD and biodiversity related Treaty focal points to formalize and empower technical working group for biodiversity assessment and monitoring
Governance and equity	Environmental policy through the MELAD and other relevant ministries has incorporated sustainable environmental management legislation.	Identifying the overlap of rights on conservation areas.	- NBSAP revision	Intergrade other policy and reviewed in environmental policy.
Connectivity and corridors	Key ministries, NGOs, and other relevant stakeholders have been identified	Data is there but there is no centralization of National Data.	- Opportunities from CBII project proposal of National Data Dossier to be implemented under the supervision of the Environment and Conservation Division	Centralization of database for a sharing hub for all stakeholders on protected areas.
Integration into wider land and seascapes	PIPA approach is being reviewed for application in the line and gilbert islands.	Capacity	- PIPA	Review and exam Gilbert island groups for PA establishment
Other effective area based conservation measures	Community based Management program - Community Based Fisheries Management - Community Based Mangrove Management Plan	Stock Assessment and mapping (fisheries surveys) Identify potential sites and resources requiring management plans	- CBMP project - Kiribati Adaptation Program Phase 3 (KAP III)	Community based management programs to be produced and endorse on the government level
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	- Biodiversity database for known threatened species	Identification of, endangered, threatened, extinct and protected species.	- Capacity Building highlighted in the reviewed NBSAP  - CBII project on data centralization	Updating national list of endangered, threatened extinct and protected species in line with Regional and international identification

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Conservation status of species in declined is improved	- Species in decline are well on the way, with turtle monitoring, IAS eradication on bird breeding ground.	Identify potential sites and resources requiring management plans	- Wild life Ordinance - Revision of NBSAP	Report on the sites surveyed and mapped Community based management plans to be developed and finalized

### 3. Marshall Islands

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine  MC: Marine 18 Terr: 16	Marine: 0.19%  Terrestrial: Needs to be determined	Marine: 10%  Terrestrial: Needs to be determined	Marine: 14% and above  Terrestrial: Needs to be determined	GEF-6 PROP Project has component dedicated to conduct marine surveys and coastal fisheries management planning. GEF-5 RMI Ridge to Reef Project has similar for terrestrial sites. The RMI needs assistance to reviewing spatial definition of coastal and marine areas, per se, in light of potential discrepancies between Aichi, Micronesia Challenge, and Reimaanlok definitions. Definitions now applied within the Marshall Islands national conservation area management framework (i.e. Reimaanlok) is: <b>Nearshore Marine Resources</b> are defined as all those resources below the high water mark ocean ward to a depth of approximately 100m (basically at the ocean-side reef drop-off), and including the entire lagoon. Given this definition, there are 14067 sq km of Nearshore Marine Resources in the RMI. By extension: <b>Terrestrial Resources</b> are defined as all land area outside of inhabited population centres. All land area in the RMI covers 182 sq km but the amount of Terrestrial Resources has not yet been calculated.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Ecological representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Biodiversity book by Nancy Vander Velde “living among a living sea”</li> <li>- Many books by Nancy, trees of the Marshall Islands</li> <li>- Atoll habitats books by Public School Systems (need to find book titles)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will be based on assessments that need to be conducted on an atoll-by-atoll basis, per the Reimaanlok process.</li> <li>- Missing species in RMI’s list both marine and terrestrial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use allocations for GEF-5 and GEF-6 to improve existing publications (status column)</li> </ul>	We are trying to assess these gaps via GEF-5 (R2R) and GEF-6 (PROP) initiatives, per the Reimaanlok process.
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>RAMSAR sites, World Heritage Sites, Community Conservation Zones through Reimaanlok Resource Management Plan</p> <p>5 IBAs have no protection, 1 IBA has protection</p>	Effective management tools in terms of monitoring plans	Monitoring existing data, reviewing and identifying information relevant to the different IBAs	Bringing some IBAs that have no protection or having partial protection under protected areas and improving management effectiveness of IBA PAs are priority actions. Understanding why they exist, and how to improve the IBAs because of modern influence.
Management effectiveness assessment(s) Improvement(s)				
Governance and equity *equity: each person should have an appropriate share.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protected Areas Network (PAN) Legislation</li> <li>- Local Governments</li> <li>- Traditional Leaders</li> <li>- Land Owners</li> <li>- National Governments</li> </ul>	Different viewpoints with item (e.g. specific species conservation might not be enforced by community because of it being a favoured item)		Develop planning actions that would allow transparency in all relevant sectors.
Connectivity and corridors			Coastal Management Advisory Council, inter-agency National environment advisory group.	Establish CMAC’s role in Aichi Target 11 and 12

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Integration into wider land and seascapes				
Other effective area-based conservation measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- World Heritage Site</li> <li>- Ramsar Sites</li> <li>- Resource Management Plan</li> <li>- Traditional protection 'mo' sites</li> </ul>	Uninhabited areas do not have clear monitoring tools		
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented				
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Endangered Species Act (Trust Territory Act, 1995, adopted as it by Nitijela) protection of endangered and threatened species and subspecies</li> <li>- MIMRA Act for Turtle conservation</li> <li>- Reimaanlok Process (National Conservation Tool) community developed resource management plans with protection zones.</li> <li>- Marine mammal protection act</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MIMRA Act only protects green hawksbills and only protects minimum sizes.</li> <li>- Lack of enforcement</li> <li>- Lack of community commitment</li> </ul>		Produce ID system of all endangered and threatened species and list the protection measures for each categories

- 1) Where are some areas important for biodiversity?
- 2) Extinction of known threatened species is prevented?
- 3) Areas important for biodiversity, Areas important for ecosystem services?
- 4) Connectivity and corridors?

#### 4. Nauru

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine		17% Terrestrial 10% Marine	Identified Biological Significant Key Sites (Bio RAP)  Identified Sites (Plants of Nauru)	GEF 5 -Improved management effectiveness of new marine conservation areas  GEF 6- Restoration of Forestation
Ecological representation	Is this before or after mining? (Current known Plant Communities) -Littoral Strand -Limestone Forest -Mangrove Forest -Freshwater Marsh -Managed Land Vegetation -Secondary Scrub -Secondary Forest -Very Little Native Forest	No protected areas  No Environment Legislation for creation or protection of biological areas	Development and Establishment of protected areas  Development of Environmental Legislation	Development of Protected Areas taking into consideration Sites identified through previous studies of possible conservation sites.
Areas important for biodiversity	-Established Area for replanting of 42 native Plant species identified for cultural and ecological value -Identified Coastal site of Endemic Tidal Rock Bug ( <i>Corallocoris nauruensis</i> ) -Identified Sites for Bird nesting -Identified Site for Endemic Skink ( <i>Emoia spp</i> ) -Reef Sites for Endangered Coral ( <i>Pocillopora fungiformis</i> ), Humpback Wrasse ( <i>Chelinus undulates</i> ), Giant Clams ( <i>Tridanca maxima</i> )	No protected areas  No Environment Legislation for creation or protection of biological areas  No protected areas  No Environment	Development and Establishment of protected areas  Development of Environmental Legislation	Development of Protected Areas taking into consideration Sites identified through previous studies of possible conservation sites.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Areas important for ecosystem services	Drafted Wetlands Conservation Areas  Drafted Marine conservation Area	Legislation for creation or protection of biological areas	Development and Establishment of protected areas  Development of Environmental Legislation	Development of Protected Areas taking into consideration Sites identified through previous studies of possible conservation sites.
Management effectiveness assessment(s)  Improvement(s)	0	0	Lessons Learned from Other PICS conservations Areas	Obtain Success Stories for implementing Conservation sites.
Governance and equity	Traditionally Based with Communities	Limited Awareness of Conservation measures and the types of conservation  No Established Multi-stakeholders committee on conservation measures	Promotion of effective Community Awareness to promote purposes for varied conservation methods  Identify relevant stakeholders for the development of the conservation committee (or similar)	Develop effective community awareness to promote purposes for varied conservation methods  Incorporate development of conservation committee (or similar) with environment policy, bill, legislation.
Connectivity and corridors	Spatial Mappings (Plants)	Interpretation of the spatial mappings to develop possible important connectivity and corridors	Development of important connectivity and corridors	Incorporate possible connectivity and corridors areas as part of conservation measures.
Integration into wider land and seascapes	0	Limitation of land and space (Terrestrial)  Marine Management Measures limited to take into consideration food security efforts (Marine)	Awareness and strengthening possible conservation measures and identified areas	Ensuring legal legislations reflect efforts for identified sites.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Other effective area-based conservation measures	0	No Environment Legislation for creation or protection of biological areas	Development of Environmental Legislation to integrate the various conservation measures adopted for identified site and the use of sites	Development of Protected Areas to integrate the various conservation measures adopted for identified site and the use of sites.
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	0	No Environment Legislation for protection of biological species	Development of Environmental Legislation to incorporate known threatened or endemic species	Identification of the various sites of threatened and endemic species for identification of effective conservation site(s)
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	0	No Environment Legislation for protection of biological species	Development of Environmental Legislation to ensure the status of known threatened or endemic species	Identification of the various sites of threatened and endemic species for identification of effective conservation site(s)

5. Palau

**Table of National Status, Gaps & Opportunities and focused actions**

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine	<p><i>Marine:</i> 41% of nearshore marine areas</p> <p><i>Terrestrial:</i> 10% of Palau's terrestrial areas</p>	<p>Palau has met the numbers for one of the goal for the Micronesia Challenge and for CBD. It needs an additional 31 km<sup>2</sup> (7%) to meet the Aichi Targets and a total of 43 km<sup>2</sup> (10%) for MC in order to meet the terrestrial requirement. Other aspects of Target 11 such as management effectiveness and others still need to be addressed</p> <p>Site level information also needs to be confirmed</p>	<p>GEF 5 and GEF 6 will provide opportunities to address the gaps including addressing threats such as invasive species to PAs. GEF 5 to assist with increasing PAs; adding at least 95,000 ha marine area and 6300 ha terrestrial area.</p> <p>PAN currently works with government and non-government agencies to address information gaps</p>	<p>Improve Management effectiveness, ecological representation, and areas of importance are identified and PAN sites are proposed or modified to integrate such information.</p> <p>PA boundaries are confirmed and delineated to have a comprehensive data set of all the sites</p>
Ecological representation	2 ecological regions (terrestrial and marine)	Work has been done on ecological representativeness of our protected areas both in marine and terrestrial landscapes, but what needs to be done is to look at and determine Palau's response to those findings to craft out an ecologically coherent network	GEF 5 will provide an opportunity to conduct such an activity under the first component of the project	National consultations to determine the configuration of the PAN network that will be determined by the overall objectives of the network
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	(What's really important is connectivity rather than just areas, it's the functionality in relation to ecosystem services) Forests, rivers, wetlands, coastal areas	Gaps would be mangroves in that although they are noted as ecologically important and habitats they are impacted by development. Disconnect between what we advocate and what we are doing	<p>Work with local agencies to look at Zero-loss of mangrove or a zero-loss of the ecological function of that mangrove</p> <p>Integrate into EIS and EAs as well as the SLM policy to be implemented – GEF 5 to help roll it out</p>	Work with EQPB to adopt the measure of zero-loss as part of the mitigation measures of development in mangrove areas
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p> <p>Improvement(s)</p>	PAME assessment was conducted for the PAN Program in 2014-2015.	The assessment is done, but improvements measures still needs to be finalized for each States and implemented	GEF 5 will provide funding that will help with the improvement of PAN program. Moving beyond just number of sites to achieving the target, but ensuring management effectiveness at the site level.	GEF 5 will work with integrating the identified areas for improvements into State PAN management plans renewals and work plans.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
				also aligning them with the National PAN Strategic Plan developed under GEF 5 as well as alignment with the SDGs.
Governance and equity	<p>4 levels of governance regimes: PAN (National network), marine sanctuary (EEZ), Global importance (UNESCO, Ramsar Site, Ngermeduu Bay Biosphere, IBAs), Traditional PAs (BUL) incorporated into State and National Protection</p> <p>100% of governance is at the State level for all PAs whether they are in the PAN program or not. Of the total PAs, 70% are under sustainable financing.</p>	<p>Management effectiveness across all these governances are unequal due uneven institutional capacity of the agencies mandated with their protection</p> <p>Sustainable financing is needed by the States to support their State PAs that are not within the PAN program</p>	<p>Opportunity with GEF 5 to improve PAN governance, but also opportunities to work with other States to improve site protection.</p> <p>Development of Eco-tourism project within PAN sites that allow for such activities to provide opportunity for sustainable financing.</p>	<p>Development of PAN National Strategic Plan</p> <p>Working towards ensuring community benefits from these PAs – to what extent has this PA benefited the communities</p>
Connectivity and corridors	<p>Hydrodynamic model by PICRC showed that marine reseedling is in a north-south direction with no return benefits. Therefore, the protection needs to be focused on the northern area of Palau.</p> <p>Terrestrial connectivity is known as one system that follows the fruiting of trees. Terrestrial corridors are easily identified by species</p>	<p>Implementation of that information to ensure continuous reseedling of the south and maintaining the protection of the north</p> <p>Development is impacting some corridors for some avifauna that needs to be addressed</p>	<p>Utilize the information in the PAN design process which works to identify the biodiversity hotspots and areas of importance. Its information that allows us to make the decision for designing our ecological representativeness. It can also help determine the value of coral reef areas for reseedling and therefore need for protection</p>	<p>Completion of the PAN design process and implementation of the results to improve the overall PAN program in its objective to conserve Palau's biodiversity.</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Integration into wider land and seascapes	<p>IWRM project worked at the watershed level looking at the holistic management of water.</p> <p>Establishment of the Palau National Marine Sanctuary</p>	Need to look at Ridge-to-Reef concept expanding such best practices from IWRM project to implement Ridge-to-Reef approach	GEF Ridge-to-Reef regional project that works towards integrated coastal management as well as integrated water resource management	<p>Successful pilot projects testing innovative solutions involving linking ICM and IWRM and CC Adaptation</p> <p>Mainstreaming R2R ICM/IWRM approaches into national development frameworks</p>
Other effective area-based conservation measures	Other governance regimes other than PAN	Enforcement and effective management of the sites are lacking	Nominate into the PAN program	Work with State governments to look into nominating PAs into the PAN program
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	Species have been identified and regulated through national legislation	Strength of enforcement and compliance with existing regulations	Through the PAN program, enforcement and compliance would be implemented	Need to incorporate information into the PAN design to expand protection to those species
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	Rat eradication efforts to reduce impacts on Bekai (endangered sp.)	Need to provide implementation and enforcement of Bekai – Megapode conservation action plan	GEF 5 to roll out the conservation action plan	Implementation at the State level and to work in tandem with the fish and wildlife agency

Aichi Targets 11 &12 Elements	Benefits accrued from the implementation of project 5208
Quantitative aspects	<p>Gap analysis of PAN coverage of important biodiversity/ecosystem services with coverage of unprotected ecosystems and unprotected threatened species identified. Gap analysis will assess the use and opportunities for a ridge to reef approach for existing and new PAN sites.</p> <p>four (4) new sites added to the PAN, adding at least 95,000 ha marine area and 6300 ha terrestrial area, significantly increasing the amount of area currently protected in the PAN (11,000ha marine and 2,100ha terrestrial)</p>
Improving ecological representation	To be tracked
Areas Important for Biodiversity	To be tracked (need for holistic approach in addressing impacts within PAN sites, case in point Ngelukes, Ngchesar where the greatest impact is sedimentation from outside the site)
Management effectiveness and equity  Equity Targets 14 and 15	at least 4 PAN sites meet a minimum METT score, and at least 5 other sites show increasing trends, towards effective conservation (e.g. reduction in over/illegal harvesting)

## 6. Papua New Guinea

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Quantitative elements Terrestrial and Marine	<p>Terrestrial : 3.8%</p> <p>The total land area of PNG under formally recognized conservation is 1,897,595ha, 91% of which is within WMAs and 4% within the current CA. This represents approximately 3.8% of the country's land area. Within the PNG Protected Area Policy 2014, it indicates that the</p>	<p>Most successful PA on the ground are not formally recognized</p> <p>Information and data not readily available to update the status of PA</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct review and assessment of current Protected area network based on the CARR principle and update the current PA database</li> <li>• Recognize, register and gazette the existing WMAs and LMMAs that meet the IUCN criteria</li> <li>• Upgrade existing successfully managed Conservation Areas, e.g. YUS and Torricelli CA</li> <li>• Conduct educational awareness of protected areas in communities based on their priorities</li> </ul>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	<p>status of these PA must be determined as part of the process moving forward.</p> <p>Marine. 0.8%. The approach to marine conservation has to date been quite different to that of historical terrestrial conservation. Several WMAs were previously established in marine areas, though in recent years, the trend has been establishment of LMMAs around the country. Those combined zoning as well as rules in their management with conservation as a fisheries management tool. There are about 12 known LMMA. Apart from that, there are many LMMAs existing around the country that are not formally recognized.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct consultations with the communities and other key stakeholders on recommendations for reclassification of PAs</li> </ul>
Ecological representation	<p>PNG is committed under the new policy to implement the CARR system for building its PA systems. There are nine terrestrial eco-regions. In 2010 a gap analysis conducted by PNG government and TNC defined the level of protection of PNG's terrestrial ecosystems and restricted range endemic species. This process also defined the critical marine and terrestrial areas for conservation. At this stage three marine bioregions have been defined as part of the Coral Triangle (1 to 3), with a further two unclassified regions in PNG. In addition, areas of outstanding marine values have been recognized and regionalisation that includes five</p>	Community conservation areas are not formally recognized		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government initiates further investigation by approaching other partners (Universities, NGOs or private industry) to support assessment, negotiations and management arrangements in identified sites of high priority.</li> <li>• Formalization of community conservation areas with boundaries that takes into consideration the language and cultural groups</li> <li>• Develop public Private partnership arrangements for industries to support the establishment of a new protected area as an offset to a planned or existing development:</li> <li>• Review of relevant legislations on land use and zoning</li> </ul>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	eco-regions and 21 shallow water bioregions, where the outer boundaries of the external eco-regions are concurrent with the outer boundary of PNG's Economic Exclusive Zone (EEZ).			
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>The Terrestrial Programs of Works on Protected Area (PoWPA) (Lipsett-Moore, Game et al. 2010) worked with targets of 10% of ecosystems for biological representation and 20% to add better climate change resilience. When software solutions were used to plot this representation across all vegetation types and land systems and to include the restricted range species, about 15% of the country would be needed to reach the 10% representation, the area needed will be approximately 22% of the country for the 10% coverage, and 33% for the 20% coverage. These figures will be higher when the needs of the community and administrative boundaries are taken into account.</p> <p>The Protected Area system will, as far as practical, include representation of the variety of geological features, freshwater ecosystems and wetlands. In addition to ecosystems and species, the Protected Area system will include examples of landscapes including geological features (such as cliffs, sand-dunes, caves, peaks, rock formations and fossils) and of</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and update inventory of land use /zone planning guidelines for terrestrial and marine protected areas</li> </ul>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	freshwater and wetland systems (such as rivers, lakes, freshwater and saline wetlands, ephemeral swamps and springs).			
Management effectiveness assessment  Improvements	<p>In PNG, where there is such a diverse range of governance, it is both essential and challenging to share information and some common standards. National government and other partners need to support on-ground managers by providing information, standards, policies, training and assistance for many aspects of Protected Area management</p> <p>Successful management planning in PNG requires cooperation of many partners and leadership or full participation of customary landowners. The rewards of undertaking a good process are considerable: apart from producing good guidelines for future actions, the planning process provides a structured opportunity for capacity building and dialogue among all the partners involved. One of the keys is for planning to be seen as a positive process of adaptive management and an opportunity for building a shared understanding, rather than a legal requirement to be fulfilled as quickly as possible. Maintaining natural integrity, cultural values and natural landscapes and seascapes across time is the highest priority of Protected</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the PAs have been degraded through development projects. Under the RAPPAM assessment, many areas were no longer under any form of active management</li> </ul> <p>Lack of cooperation among government, civil society and customary land owners</p> <p>Producing useful and applicable management plans for all Protected Areas that are approved at high level and make a difference on the ground is a challenge that few Protected Area agencies have overcome successfully.</p>	<p>A workforce to manage Protected Areas in PNG will consist of people from diverse organizations – including government agencies, NGOs, industry and local community groups - as well as individual customary landowners. However, over time, this Policy encourages and supports the development of a nation-wide Protected Area Workforce community, where this diverse group has some common training, standards and access to a common support network of information and resources, such as Internet-based systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and apply policies for biodiversity management planning, monitoring and reporting, natural and cultural resource management, and law enforcement of the Protected Area</li> <li>• establishment of PA management standards and PA performance monitoring system for different categories of PAs;</li> <li>• (ii) institutionalization of clear reporting structure and methods for all categories of PAs;</li> <li>• (iii) establishment of law enforcement and habitat/biodiversity monitoring protocols;</li> <li>• (iv) clear official guidelines for community involvement in the management of Conservation Areas;</li> <li>• (v) clear capacity development strategies and action plans for increasing management effectiveness of the PA system (National Parks, Wildlife Sanctuaries and Conservation Areas);</li> <li>• (vi) incentive mechanisms for increasing motivation of technical staff;</li> <li>• (vii) Establishment and institutionalization of PA data/information and knowledge management system enabling learning from and up-scaling of pilot/individual project activities.</li> <li>• Evaluate biodiversity management effectiveness every three years to demonstrate the successes and challenges for each Protected Area in PNG.</li> </ul>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	<p>Area management, along with delivering sustainable benefits to customary landowners. Different Protected Area types and zones will be managed on land and sea according to the management principles, values and conservation agreements for individual protected area.</p> <p>The purpose of the Conservation Area is to protect and conserve the natural ecosystems and wildlife there. This includes both forest and reef. These areas are therefore off limits to any kind of hunting, clearing, and gardening, or any kind of activity that might destroy or reduce the health and size of the ecosystems. Forest for Use Zone The zone acts as a buffer between the CA and the village and livelihoods areas. A high standard will be set by Protected Area managers by following best practical processes and by avoiding or minimising environmental impacts of all protected area operations, including fire management, pest management, and resource use. Training, guidelines and the requirements for proper equipment will be developed by CEPA in achieving these standards. Protected Area management at all levels, but especially through National and Provincial Governments, will actively engage</p>			

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	with other government institutions and industry to ensure that policy, legislation and development approvals are compatible with protection of natural integrity on Protected Areas.			
Governance and Equity	<p>The network of Protected Areas in PNG were established and recognized under four (4) different legislations at the national government's level and in line with the IUCN category system: The types are National Parks, Conservation Areas, WMA's, RAMSAR, World Heritage Areas, Sanctuaries, Buffer Zones (under codes of practice), Customary protection (Tambu Areas).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other forms of Protection and Management that contribute to the National Network of Protected and Managed areas are Protected Areas established under the Organic Law at the Provincial level (OLPLLG) includes marine (LMMA's - Locally Managed Marine Areas) terrestrial (CMA's - Community Managed Areas) – Voluntary agreements (Conservation Deed - private arrangement under contract law).</li> </ul> <p>The administrative structure and processes including lines of responsibilities, accountability and operational systems varies from one type of protected area to another. This is also the determining factor of management effectiveness of the</p>	<p>At the National level, the existing systems and processes under the various legislations are operational but lack proper administrative processes and procedures and management guidelines.</p> <p>Most PA that are shared governed, or governed by the local communities and private organizations are well managed but not gazetted/-recognized</p> <p>Fragmented legal framework and unclear roles and responsibilities of different actors for each of the PA types</p> <p>Lack of registry of existing PA with</p>	<p>More determined approach to give recognition to the CCA and some of the LMMAs</p> <p>updated registry is essential for monitoring and reporting work on PA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review, repeal and develop legislative framework to potentially integrate them to aid in determining the governance and management structure and administrative arrangements of each PA</li> <li>• Streamline and harmonize for each respective Protected Areas types' selection criteria, processes and procedure using local, national and international standard and examples into new PA classification system to suit PNG local context</li> <li>• Institutionalize and formalize the management and governance arrangements for the PA network so the links between policies and national framework for protected areas and implementation on the ground are established</li> <li>• Development of Protected Area Register managed by CEPA with information being routinely incorporated into forestry, mining and infrastructure development proposals, and for the information to be available for interested stakeholders</li> <li>• Zoning within the Protected Area, management plans, conservation agreements and the wishes of customary landowners and communities will also influence where and when activities take place, and set standards and conditions</li> <li>• Develop PA Management Plan and land use plan guidelines for various types of PA in the context of the national framework for protected areas</li> <li>• Develop contractual agreements /deeds/MoU with relevant private or landowners including neighbouring tribes and clans on management structure of protected</li> </ul>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	<p>protected areas in PNG.</p> <p>It turns out that Protected areas governed by local communities, shared governed and private entities are successfully managed than the PA governed by the National government.</p> <p>To enhance the quality of PA governance, the Government of PNG has recently endorsed the PNG Protected Areas Policy 2014.</p> <p>The policy states that the PNG Protected Areas Network will be successful only with clear and effective institutional arrangements, and with high levels of cooperation among governments, civil society and importantly, the customary landowners.</p> <p>Key elements to consider when reviewing and establishing the institutional and governance arrangements of PA include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Respect for rights and the rule of law</li> <li>• Promotion of positive negotiations and discussions</li> <li>• Fair access to information</li> <li>• Accountability in decision making</li> <li>• Fair resolution of disputes and conflicts</li> <li>• Fair benefit sharing</li> </ul> <p>Free prior informed consent of customary landowners and communities will be the basis for the entire network.</p>	<p>clear information and data on the special features of the PA.</p> <p>Resulted in overlapping responsibilities with other agencies, e.g., Forestry and Mining</p> <p>Limitation of incorporation of traditional knowledge into management practices</p> <p>Absence of overall guidance for managing diverse types of protected areas</p>		<p>area, shared responsibilities and fair benefit sharing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop administrative process and procedures requirements for listing of PA in the PA Network Register</li> <li>• Support and build capacity for customary landowners in their initiatives to establish effective protected areas on their land</li> <li>• Identify the donors and partners for each specific PA types for sustainable technical and financial support</li> </ul>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
Connectivity and corridors	The Protected Area Network will strive to maintain where possible continuous connectivity along natural gradients across climatic zones, montane slopes, river basins, and from offshore to onshore and tidal areas.			
Integration into wider land and seascape	Under the current Protected Areas Policy, the Protected Area Network will be comprehensive in conserving the range of ecosystems. The Protected Area Network will be developed with the primary focus of including as much of PNG's landscape and biological diversity as possible. Comprehensiveness will be achieved first by conserving examples of the full range of natural terrestrial, freshwater and marine habitats and ecosystems, based on a consistent national approach to bioregional and ecosystem classification.			
Other effective area based conservation measures	Until such time as a more thorough classification of terrestrial ecosystems is available, the Conservation Priority Areas identified through the analysis of land systems, forest inventory management units and restricted range endemic species with consideration of climate change refugia (Lipsett-Moore, Game et al. 2010) will be used to guide priorities for establishing terrestrial Protected Areas			

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
<p>Extinction of known threatened species is prevented</p>	<p>In partnership with the UNDP and the Bishop Museum in Hawaii, the PNG government is compiling a species data assessment to determine the status of the species on the IUCN red list. Special consideration will be given to endemic, rare and threatened species, and efforts will be made to prevent extinctions of populations and species. Priority will be given to places where concentrations of threatened and endemic species occur, to centres of endemism and to important places for migratory species including flyways.</p>			
<p>Conservation status of species in decline is improved</p>	<p>The Protected Areas Policy and legislative framework provides for effective measures to be in place that will be enforced to ensure improvement in the conservation status of species. The Protected Area Network as a whole, as well as individual Protected Areas will be designed to maximize resilience to climate change impacts and other threats, by recognising new threats to the system, by increasing connectivity at both local and broad scales, and by identifying and protecting refugia areas. Potential wildlife refugia against climate change. Climate change can be on a large scale, such as high mountain ranges, or a small scale, such as a small caverns and rocky slopes. Protected Areas should where possible include:</p>			

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Focused Actions
	<p>Ecological refugia, such as where it is higher, cooler or wetter than surrounding lands, or where species can shelter in rocks, caves or deeper water</p> <p>Evolutionary refugia, where many endemic species continue to survive as the surrounding landscape and seascape changes.</p> <p>Human-induced refugia, areas of natural habitat where surrounding areas have been cleared or altered. “Trigger points”, habitats from which climate-adapted species may spread in the future.</p>			

**7. Samoa**

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
<p>Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine</p>	<p>33% terrestrial, 23% inshore areas</p> <p>2002 – EEZ Samoa declared as sanctuary for whales, dolphins, sharks and turtles</p> <p>6 IBA’s</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No legal status for some of the protected areas in both terrestrial, marine and IBA’s</li> <li>• Land tenure issues, i.e. Some of conservation areas are on private lands and government has limited or no funding mechanism for compensation</li> <li>• Limited national allocation of budget from government for ecosystems and species conservation work</li> <li>• No system in place to monitor the effectiveness of protected areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve information on the status of ecosystems and species through the use of BIORAP and project assessments</li> <li>• Increase number of areas under protection by declaring the Savaii Uplands as protected area</li> <li>• Strengthen the engagement of communities in the planning and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorses EMC Bill.</li> <li>• Obtain legal status for the PA’s without legal status</li> <li>• Establish Savaii upland as a protected area</li> <li>• Update the status of Protected Area network to include the Matautu district CCA and Taga Gataivai established under the FPAM project and Malololelei reserve.</li> </ul>



Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p> <p>Improvement(s)</p>	<p>No management effectiveness assessment carried out</p> <p>NA – To be decided when assessment is completed</p>	<p>No legal requirement to undertake management effectiveness</p>	<p>Explore opportunities to initiate a process for assessing management effectiveness under existing projects e.g. SMSMCL and FPAM</p>	<p>Undertake management effectiveness assessment of protected areas under government</p>
<p>Governance and equity</p>	<p>Different types of governance for protected areas: Government protected areas – National Parks and Reserves Community conservation areas Fisheries reserves MPA's Historical reserves Cultural sites Recreational reserves</p>	<p>No clear boundaries of some of the reserves</p> <p>No social assessment of equity and effectiveness of governance</p>	<p>Include demarcation of boundaries for government reserves under the work plan of the responsible entity in the next financial year</p>	<p>Undertake boundary surveys for government protected areas</p> <p>Undertake assessment of equity and effectiveness of governance Encourage the establishment of CCA's following the process enacted under the EMC Bill</p> <p>Formulate management plans for interested communities</p>
<p>Connectivity and corridors</p>	<p>Fisheries reserves</p> <p>IBA's</p>	<p>Absent of collaborative agreement between villages</p> <p>Not all reserves have management plans</p> <p>No connectivity and corridors developed for the conservation of critical bird and sea birds</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review current arrangement for fisheries reserves</li> <li>• Review recovery plans for Manumea and Maomao</li> <li>• Develop recovery plans for other critically endangered birds</li> </ul>	<p>Formulate management plans for all fisheries reserves</p> <p>Initiate collaborative management arrangement for fisheries reserves between villages</p> <p>Implement possible actions to ensure there are forest corridors available to sustain the population of Samoa's endangered birds</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Integration into wider land and seascapes	<p>Savaii Upland Forest has been recommended by the BIORAP 2012 to be designated as a biosphere reserves/Ramsar site</p> <p>Samoa EEZ designated as sanctuary for whales, sharks and dolphins and turtles</p> <p>Strengthening Multisectoral Management of Critical Landscape</p>	<p>No management plan for SUF</p> <p>No legal framework to formally designate Samoa EEZ as sanctuary</p>	<p>Work in collaboration with local communities to identify the most appropriate and effective management and governance for the Savaii Upland Forest</p> <p>Provision under EMC Bill to formally designate Samoa EEZ as sanctuary</p>	<p>Formulate management for SUF</p> <p>Develop regulation under EMC Bill for SUF</p>
Other effective area-based conservation measures	CCA's MPA's	<p>Some do not have management plans</p> <p>Identify and conduct assessments of vulnerable ecosystems and make inform decisions</p>	<p>Management plans to be formulated under SGP of UNDP and other projects</p> <p>Trainings and awareness programs to communities with critical lands</p>	<p>Formulate and implement management plans</p> <p>Develop a tentative list of critical and or vulnerable/threatened ecosystems using international/national criteria</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
<p>Extinction of known threatened species is prevented</p>	<p>Monitoring work has been conducted for threatened species like Manumea and Maomao</p> <p>Propagation of important plant species <i>Micromelum minutum</i> for swallowtail butterfly</p> <p>Propagation of rare plant species at Vailima Botanical Garden nursery</p> <p>Monitoring of turtle nesting sites</p> <p>Recovery plans for Manumea and Maomao</p>	<p>Limited surveys in other part of the Savaii Upland Forest</p> <p>Lack of technical knowledge in the propagation of some of the endemic plants</p>	<p>NTBG survey for rare plant species 2016</p> <p>SMSMCL BIORAP 2016</p> <p>ICCRIF BIORAP 2014</p> <p>SCS – Darwin project</p> <p>Develop agreement with the government of Am. Samoa the possibility of bringing back the swallowtail butterfly</p>	<p>Discuss with landowners and local communities the possibility of establishing CCA's for the prevention of threatened species</p> <p>Develop a list of threatened plant species</p> <p>Promote planting and conservation of threatened plant species in <i>ex-situ</i> conservation programmes</p> <p>Continue turtle monitoring by MNRE</p> <p>Conduct pest control programmes in critical areas for manumea and other ground nesting birds</p> <p>Continue control programmes for the Crown of Thorns and assessment of other marine invasive species</p> <p>Develop a butterfly facility for breeding programmes</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Conservation status of species in declined is improved	<p>No programmes implemented to improve conservation status of species</p> <p>More recent and current surveys are aiming at collecting and refining available information to support decision making to improve population of species in declined</p>	<p>Lack of funding to initiate breeding programmes locally</p> <p>Little/poor technical capacity in the national level to operate breeding facilities and conduct research on species of concern</p> <p>Lack of data on population status of critical biota</p>	<p>SMSMCL project</p> <p>NTBG project</p> <p>ICCRIF project</p> <p>DARWIN project under SCS</p>	<p>Train local staff to gain exceptional technical expertise to study and implement species conservation <i>in situ</i></p> <p>Seek and request for available funds and expertise to develop captive breeding programme for critically endangered species</p> <p>Implement breeding programmes to improve population status of species</p>

## 8. Solomon Islands

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
<p>Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine</p> <p>SINBSAP National Target -10% TPA and 15% MPA</p>	<p>GEF-5: 5% Terrestrial protected areas (needs verification)</p> <p>CT Atlas (MPAs known boundaries 2012) = 402sqkm. = 2%; 416 sites in record</p>	<p>Work toward &gt; 5% – TPA</p> <p>Work toward &gt;13% - MPA</p> <p>Demarcation – Community/Provincial/National boundaries/legal rights/inshore and offshore.</p> <p>Expand to other sectors – Fisheries</p>	<p>GEF-5 Implementation-add 100,000ha – +3% TPA</p> <p>MACBIO- MSP process/Ocean12+ establishment</p> <p>Fisheries and Management Act 2015</p> <p>Protected Areas Act 2010 declarations – 1 to be declared 2015; 9 more in</p>	<p>Update PA status, coverage for terrestrial and marine – update the National database, input into SPREP PA Portal and then submit to WDPA.</p> <p>Implement and track GEF- 5/6 PA outcomes</p> <p>Develop and implement PA roadmap to achieving Aichi Target 11 – Review and Update POWPA Plan. Reviewed NBSAP draft to include gaps.</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
			<p>progress towards legal declaration by 2 years: Giving legal recognition to existing PAs</p>	
<p>Ecological representativeness</p>	<p>KBAs = IBAs/AZEs – CEPF Profiling = 36 KBAs identified – 1,521,068 hectares; 5-AZEs – 3,997,537 hectares Forest/Mangroves/Seagrass and Coral Reefs Habitats maps Ridges to Reefs initiatives – Choiseul, Isabel (Provincial-scale); Kolombangara, Jorio-Berakasi (Vella-la-vella); Tetepare, Tawatana, Zaira, Malaita Province (resource mapping-values not habitat)  GIS capacity within MECDM/MECDM</p>	<p>Ecological maps  Connectivity Studies – corridors, migratory paths, nesting, feeding  Reporting and ongoing monitoring with partners on sites and</p>	<p>MACBIO/EPOG Project – GIS (Sol-GEO)  CEPF Program – KBAs/AZEs  Partnerships/networks by CBOs/ NGOs/ Universities</p>	<p>Review status of existing KBAs and AZEs and IBAs  Target full protection for at least 2 AZEs and partial protection of 3 at least AZEs (<i>numbers can be change per review</i>)  Develop ecological maps for each Provinces</p>
<p>Areas important for biodiversity  Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>KBAs / EBSAs identified MACBIO/SolGeo – GIS maps; Current Research Expeditions for KBAs  MACBIO- Economic Assessment and Valuation of Marine Ecosystem Services: Solomon Islands  Site Studies- Coral Valuation Study; Mangrove – Carbon Sequestration;</p>	<p>Need targeted/integrated planning for areas important for Biodiversity (Priorities) Need identification/mapping of Areas(Sites) important for ecosystem services Need economic assessment and valuation of Terrestrial ecosystem services National Assessment/Valuation/ Management Plans for key ecosystems Links to other sector –</p>	<p>CEPF Program MACBIO Project; Community management plans REDD+ National, Provincial and Community Development Plans NGOs and Communities protected areas initiatives/programs/projects Climate Change Projects on Food security, Disaster Risks; National V&amp; A maps</p>	<p>Map Priorities Areas important for BIODIVERSITY and areas important for ecosystem services.</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
		tourism, climate change adaptation/disaster risks; forestry, infrastructure developments etc.	in GIS Unit	
Management effectiveness assessment(s)  Improvement(s)	Limited assessment of management effectiveness. Few sites supported by NGOs/Universities – Tetepare, Arnavons, Choiseul sites, Centrals,  Draft Marine Management effectiveness tool (piloted) CBRM protocols, principles  Development and pilot testing of LMMA sites in Central Islands; SILMMA – MPA, LMMA and Taboos categories (CTAtlas).	Develop/Improve PA Management effectiveness assessment tools/guidelines  Categorization of PAs – locally managed, taboos  Limited - Training and Capacity building for communities, managers and government officers	CEPF programs; Capacity building programs - SIRA; PA Managers Training; PA Management Committees  PA legal registration under PA Act.  CTI Program – Management Effectiveness monitoring LEVEL 2 CTMPAS.	Develop and finalize Management Effectiveness assessment tools/manuals  Conduct ME assessments in PAs/proposed PAs  Work with PA practitioners for reporting Management effectiveness ratings for sites.  Input into national databases (Level 2 for MPAs/ LMMAs)
Governance and equity	Governance is divided into: Local - level Provincial – level National – level  Governance-types that exists now are: - NGO+Communities managed areas = e.g.	Recognition by National /Provincial governments – process of recognition unclear;  Conflicting development and conservation policies and decisions by National/Provincial	Protected areas programme – development  PA network – lessons learned  Existing governance models  Site – level socio-economic	Establish National PA Technical Team – Govt. Province, NGOs, practitioners, community reps  Conduct socioeconomic assessment for PAs – what benefits did communities derive from PAs. Governance Assessment, Social Assessment of PAs

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
	<p>KIBCA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provincial+Communities+ NGO managed areas</li> <li>- Tribal/Indigenous managed areas e.g TDA, LLCTC</li> <li>- Community managed areas – e.g. Arnavons, Zaira,</li> <li>- Government – Honiara Botanical Garden, Queen Elizabeth Park</li> <li>- Government+Private+Tribe = Kongulai Catchment</li> </ul> <p>Protected Areas Act 2010 lists 5 Categories, requires of Establishment of Management Committees, Rangers, Inspectors, Protected Areas Advisory Committee and can establish Provincial sub-committees.</p> <p>NGO programs attempts to address incorporation of traditional knowledge into Management Practices.</p> <p>Limited/No clear guidance for addressing benefit-sharing arrangements from Protected/Conservation areas – though promoted by some NGOs programs with communities</p> <p>Emerging Community Conservation Agreements (KIBCA, AMNH, SICCP), endowment Funds (Tetepare and Arnavons),</p>	<p>Government</p> <p>Land/marine tenure systems – e.g Community vs. Tribes; Government land reforms</p> <p>Landowners vs. resource users – divide. Settlers – e.g. Gizo, Waghina, Rendova Harbour, Kolombangara</p> <p>Governances mixed with Management – conflicts</p> <p>Assessments on governance and equity – what this means? Need skills and capacity</p>	<p>assessments (health, food security, water, education, income generation)</p>	<p>Review M &amp; E questionnaires for PAs evaluation.</p> <p>National classifying Governance and Equity categories for existing Pas – Assessing Equity – Using Governance Matrix; (Review in particular Private governance PAs. E.g. Njari Island, Chea, Uepi, Dive spots, Community agreements)</p> <p>Linking National categories with IUCN Categories</p> <p>Strengthen incorporation of traditional knowledge into Management practices</p> <p>Provide better guidance for addressing benefit-sharing arrangements</p> <p>Documenting case-studies on governances/lesson learned</p> <p>Share information on existing CCAs, endowment funds for potential interest PA groups.</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Connectivity and corridors	<p>Project-led connectivity studies – SPAGs, nesting, foraging sites, migratory paths, freshwater assessments</p> <p>Ridge to Reefs initiatives</p> <p>LMMA Networks – SILMMA</p>	<p>National priority mapping of connectivity and corridors</p> <p>Understanding land and marine tenure systems</p> <p>Migratory species</p> <p>Technical capacity – government and communities</p>	<p>Dugong/Seagrass/Turtle programs (tagging, nesting sites protected.)</p> <p>CTI Seascapes program – transboundary (e.g. BSSE); proposed Western and Isabel Province Seascapes Region and Temotu and Vanuatu Seascape region. Research – NGOs, Universities, Students Provincial networks - seascapes approaches</p>	<p>Review and updated connectivity and corridor studies – Map areas</p> <p>Work with Partners/stakeholders to identify these sites within KBAs and other potential sites – based on priority species.</p>
Integration into wider land and seascapes	<p>Ridges to reefs initiatives</p> <p>MACBIO – MSP process – establishment of Ocean12+ group at the national level</p> <p>Sector – Agriculture/ land-use Plan</p> <p>NBSAP review</p> <p>Key emphasis of GEF6 National Prioritization discussions</p>	<p>Interpretation of terms and concepts (need capacity and practice and time)</p> <p>No Integrated Coastal Management Framework/Plan</p> <p>Community consultation, participation and involvement in design and planning</p> <p>Cross – sectors – conflicting values and benefits</p>	<p>GIS Mapping</p> <p>Mainstreaming PA into National Development Strategy 2015-2035</p> <p>Review of NBSAP</p> <p>GEF-6 PIF design</p> <p>National Development Strategy 2015-2025 in place.</p>	<p>Initiate PA programming with wider land and seascape planning and management – Community level, Provincial level, National level and transboundary</p> <p>Support Provincial level Ridges to Reefs Initiatives for other Provinces – support at least 4 more Provincial land-use planning and profiling</p> <p>Work with Provinces and Communities to integrate PAs into the Provincial Development Plans</p> <p>Conduct economic valuation of PAs for sectors. – Commence with declared PAs under PA Act.</p>
Other effective area based conservation measures	<p>LMMA, taboos, CBRM, open-close seasons, cultural sites, WHS (East Rennell), Community conservation areas</p> <p>PA Act 2010 – 5 Categories as guidance</p>	<p>Cultural heritage mapping? Link to Ministry of Culture</p>	<p>NGOs, CBOs and communities’ initiatives</p> <p>Sacred sites/islands/ uninhabited islands e.g. Mary Island: Guadalcanal Mountains;</p>	<p>Conduct Stakeholder learning and best practices forums</p> <p>Clarify PA Categories in SI (Fisheries Act, Forestry Act, PA Act, Provincial Ordinances)</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
				<p>Trainings – develop guidelines; Capacity building for ECD/other stakeholders                      &gt;&gt;Protected areas technical/expert groups/network sharing                      &gt;&gt; training for government, stakeholders, communities on how to develop PA Management Plans                      Document/ case studies – give more clarity/guidance on what are “<i>other effective area based conservation measures</i>”                      Develop PA Evaluation /Check-lists for assisting officers in supporting and guiding establishment of PAs.</p>
<p>Extinction of known threatened species is prevented</p>	<p>Regulated and Prohibited Species (WPMA Act)</p> <p>CITES conventions – coruzia zebrata, butterflies; giant clam shells, green snails, bech-der-mer, hawskill and leatherback</p> <p>CEPF Priority Species Sites for Investment - ongoing</p> <p>Community protected areas – species-specific protected areas</p>	<p>Limited support for Species specific projects &gt; Integrated into wider Protected/-management areas design (designated areas)</p> <p>National management plans and regulations – Non-detrimental findings</p> <p>IUCN Red Listing – national review/updating</p> <p>Endemic Species management/policy – Mammals, Birds, Plants (kauri, tubi), Cetaceans (Dugongs, Whales, Dolphins)</p> <p>Capacity gaps – enforcement of environment and fisheries laws, EIA guidelines</p> <p>Protection (partial) of least two AZEs</p>	<p>Review Wildlife Management and Protection Act – underway</p> <p>Fisheries and Management Act 2015 &gt;&gt; Now undertaking Regulation reviews</p> <p>Turtle programmes – e.g. TDA partnership with USFWS</p> <p>Dugong and Seagrass Project implementation in Malaita, Western Province and Temotu</p>	<p>Review status of threatened species/endemic species – Build into national databases. Species Listing updated.</p> <p>Conduct BIORAP /SOE 2017</p> <p>Develop or enhance Species Regulations and Management Plans or Policies</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority Actions
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	<p>Leatherback/Hawksbill Turtle programme – Tetepare, Zaira, Arnavons, Waihau, Marau, Rendova, Kolombangara</p> <p>Protection of 400m absl of Kolombangara.</p> <p>Research programs for Mammals in Western Province, Temotu, Guadalcanal, Makira, Malaita, Choiseul – CEPF</p> <p>Establishing National Species Listing &gt; National Database (ECD)</p>	<p>Data and information gaps – Status to be assessment</p> <p>Laws/regulations – enforcement and compliance</p>	<p>Research programmes with Universities, NGO partners and communities.</p> <p>New partnerships – WCS, IUCN,</p> <p>SPREP, CTI threatened species programme</p> <p>Dugong and Seagrass Turtle project – GEF/UNEP/CMS</p> <p>Review of Environment Act ongoing – pollution and development control</p> <p>CITES enforcement agencies</p> <p>MFMR collaboration/partnership</p>	<p>Review and update conservation status of species (BIORAP)</p> <p>Work with existing sites to update status of species &gt; provincial level &gt; national Level.</p> <p>Protected areas for species or habitat management</p> <p>Support and monitor CEPF implementation</p> <p>Support /Encourage and support community species management plans – turtles,</p> <p>Set up national Species Monitoring and reporting mechanisms/guidelines &gt; inbuilt into national database.</p>

**Most Priority:**

- Re-structure Environment and Conservation Division to have clear Protected Areas Programme and appropriate mechanisms e.g. PA Technical Working Group (terrestrial/marine)
- Evaluation and Declaration of Protected areas sites submitted under the PA Act (1-2016, 9 in progress)
- NBSAP Review – include suggested actions
- Commence GEF-5 Implementation – Inception?
- PA National datasets reviewed and updated – WDPA, SPREP PA Portal and MECDM PA databases.
- Explore and Pilot Rehabilitation and restoration project for logged over areas – cost of damage assessment/potential PAs – Closed Area Category (Map of Logged over Areas)

**Need for support in:**

- Conduct National Biodiversity Assessment – marine/terrestrial – State of Environment Report/BIORAP
- Conduct Economic Valuation for PAs to be used for government, communities, other sectors

- Ecological information – components, processes, connectivity
- Need Management Effectiveness tools/guidelines/capacity for national, communities
- GIS Spatial mapping and analysis
- Inter-agency coordination and lead for Land and Forest Values and uses (development plans) – Lead Agency? Ministry of Lands, Attorney General’s Office (Land Reform), Ministry of Home Affairs and Ministry of Provincial Government, traditional Forums e.g. Council of Chiefs (Isabel and Choiseul).

**9. Tonga**

<b>Element of Targets 11 and 12</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Gaps</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Priority actions</b>
<p>Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine</p> <p>National target (20 per cent Terrestrial and 30 per cent Marine)</p>	<p>13. 53% Terrestrial (91sq km)</p> <p>36.4% (254.85 sq km)</p>	<p>6.47% Terrestrial</p> <p>Achieved 30percent national target for Marine quantitative elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quantitative data representation of Tonga’s biodiversity</li> <li>- Lack of a data management system for biodiversity</li> <li>- Verify and endorse Marine Spatial Plan for Tonga for implementation</li> <li>- Lack of data updating to national and regional databases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integrate BIORAP findings and recommendations</li> <li>- The 7 sites approved by cabinet to be gazetted</li> <li>- Conservation of sites of significant value. 22sites altogether (6 for terrestrial conservation, 12 for marine conservation and 4 for both)</li> <li>- Check the PIFs of the GEF related projects and update whatever can contribute to the targets</li> <li>- Update data to be reported under the sixth National Report to CBD</li> <li>- Mobilize resources for ongoing conservation work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complete formalization of gazettement the 7 priority areas identified under the BIORAP and its boundaries coordinates</li> <li>- Finalize the 27 proposed SMA sites for cabinet submission</li> <li>-Develop the National Marine Spatial planning framework</li> <li>- Follow up on the PIFs for all related Biodiversity projects and how we can link the outputs and outcomes to the Targets 11 and 12 and revise our status.</li> <li>- BIORAP for Tongatapu, ‘EUa, Ha’apai and Niuas</li> <li>- Socioeconomic assessments on the economic value of biodiversity on the different island groups of Tonga</li> </ul>



Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
Management effectiveness assessment(s)  Improvement(s)	None	Analysis on management effectiveness.	- GEF 7 - Seek Technical guidance and financial assistance from Bilateral agencies and development partners(PACE-NET, IUCN, SPREP, SPC, etc.)	To seek funding to conduct the management effectiveness of protected areas.
Governance and equity	<b>Legislation/Policy Governing Protected Areas in Tonga</b> - Parks and Reserves Act - Fisheries Management Act and Regulations - Environment Management Act - Environment Impact Assessment Act and Regulations - Land Use Policy - Forest Management Act - Birds Act	- Lack of regulations under respective legislation to enforce compliance for protected areas - Lack of awareness of protected areas	- Compliance would ensure of sustainability of food security, livelihoods and poverty reduction.	- Revise legislations governing Biodiversity - Strengthen the role of the authority governing respective legislation. - Strengthen the existing governing mechanism for compliance and enforcement - Revise the NBSAP to align with Aichi targets, SDGs, Tonga Strategic Development Framework and other Regional Action Plans - Community Consultations on effective management of PAs - Develop a Biodiversity Policy Framework
Connectivity and corridors	R2R Ministry of Fisheries (SMA) Lands Department  Climate Change Adaptation Projects Tourism	Ensure that Biodiversity is mainstreamed into the related sectors	Mobilization of resources for the implementation of the Marine Spatial Planning and NBSAP.	- Complete the gazetting processes for PAs - Develop a Marine Spatial Plan and an atlas on Biodiversity hotspots and Important Areas for Conservation. - Management Plans should be formulated or revised for all protected areas.

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
Integration into wider land and seascapes	Ridge to Reef Approach	National Dialogue and Planning	Minimize the impact of land based activities on Marine Areas	- Implement the Tonga National Programme of Action for the Protection of Marine Environment from Land-based Activities.
Other effective area based conservation measures	- SMA's - Toloa Rainforest	Lack of capacity to access available funds for implementation	- Expand the SMA's	- Develop and revise all Management Plans for Protected Areas. - Capacity-Building for Resource Mobilization
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	- Megapode Recovery Plan - National Reports to the CBD. - National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP) - Sharks Management Plan	Lack of resources to implement recommendation for species conservation	- Thematic Area 4 on Species Conservation is mainstreamed into other sectors for implementation.	- Develop Recovery Plans for threatened species from BIORAP surveys - Mobilize resources to implement the NBSAP and NISSAP
Conservation status of species in decline is improved	- Hengahenga, megapode. - Monitoring Status report. - 5 <sup>th</sup> National Report	- Monitor and assess the status of rare and endangered species	- Seek more funding from Birdlife international to do more surveys, SPREP for BIORAP, MACBIO - Explore ways to introduce tax in the Whale Watching Industry for whale research and conservation.	- Engage the private sector, communities and public sector on getting data for those species in decline. - Develop public, private partnership to enforce protection of the megapodes, hengahenga, whales, sharks, etc. - Explore the introduction of environmental tax for eco-tourism particularly for whale watching, etc. - Declare the 7 priority sites identified under BIORAPs as Protected Areas under the relevant legislation

**10. Tuvalu**

<b>Element of Targets 11 and 12</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Gaps</b>	<b>Opportunities</b>	<b>Priority actions</b>
Quantitative elements: terrestrial and marine (areas)	<p>Terrestrial areas – No data available</p> <p>Marine areas – 74.892/900,000 = 8.3%</p>	<p>Need to conduct survey to confirm the % for terrestrial area</p> <p>No centralized data storage currently available in the Environment Department</p>	<p>The demarcation of marine areas under the IIB project is a good opportunity to verify the information of % coverage for both terrestrial and marine area</p> <p>Assistance from the CBD to establish country Clearing House Mechanism- to store all the data and information that related to Protected area</p>	<p>To carry out the demarcation of the remaining 4 islands next month at the least</p> <p>To establish clearing house mechanism for storage and sharing purposes</p>
Ecological representativeness	<p>Map of Funafuti, Nukulaelae and Nanumea conservation area boundaries and also marked out some point of interest at all stations investigated in those 3 islands</p>	<p>No updated data of reef fish biodiversity and conservation area for the other outer islands</p> <p>No information on the adjacent land and fish spawning aggregation sites</p>	<p>Used the NAPA II and R2R project component that related to Biodiversity</p>	<p>To include more land and sea areas and fish spawning aggregation sites on the existing marine conservation area</p>
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>No study done so far to identify island hotspots.</p> <p>Funafuti conservation area</p> <p>9 locally managed marine area</p> <p>Mangrove replantation in Nanumea and Funafuti</p>	<p>Shortage of long term funding for marine conservation</p> <p>Lack of systematic and scientific monitoring of population trends and MPA effectiveness</p> <p>Lack coordinated data sharing efforts</p>	<p>Identify island hotspots in each island</p> <p>To out scale the replanting mangrove program to other outer islands through the Talofa Overview project (Japan NGOs)</p>	<p>Identify at least one island hotspot</p> <p>Identify the spawning aggregation site and to see whether it is inside the CA or not.</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p> <p>Improvement(s)</p>	<p>Currently all the marine areas are locally managed by the communities. Only one (Funafuti) is formally legislated, and its management plan still in draft. Site-specific management measures in each island appear to be effective in maintaining fish productivity in the outer islands but Funafuti need improvement</p> <p>Pollution from urbanized areas (Funafuti) Sargassum bloom in Funafuti lagoon</p>	<p>No management plan in place for all the nine islands</p> <p>Further protection of spawning aggregations is needed</p> <p>Monitoring effectiveness of management and traditional harvesting on fish population</p> <p>No long-term coral reef monitoring</p>	<p>Through the R2R project, one of its outcomes is to assist communities in developing their management plan for their marine areas.</p> <p>To set up a customary management committee on each islands. This committee involve community representatives from the Falekaupule, women, youth, local fisherman, commercial fisherman and Kaupule</p>	<p>Establish management plan for the 9 islands</p> <p>Enforce their management plan</p> <p>Improve Funafuti management</p>
<p>Governance and equity</p>	<p>Conservation Area – managed by the Kaupule ( Town Council)</p> <p>LMMA- managed by the Falekaupule (decision made by Chiefs) with community inputs</p>	<p>Challenges with monitoring and enforcement in Funafuti (urbanized area)</p> <p>Insufficiency understanding among local Kaupule and other Government decision makers about existing MPAs/MMAs and their management framework</p> <p>Confusion on the terminology used between protected area and the Managed area</p>	<p>The R2R project with the assistance from the Fisheries Dept to help communities and Kaupules by working with their existing governance structures to strengthen and formalize them, which could include reclassification of certain areas and redevelopment of the agreements previously made (if necessary)</p>	<p>To collect information about existing by-laws and local agreements with respect to “no take zone” and “controlled catch” and the timing of enforcement and ongoing management practices</p>

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
Connectivity and corridors	Poor understanding of spatial connectivity for corals, fish, and other species	Poor understanding of spatial connectivity for corals, fish, and other species	Conduct terrestrial and marine BioRAP survey will provide better understanding on the connectivity	Improve understanding Funafuti area ecological connectivity and human impacts (ballast water from cargo ship, sewage runoff)
Integration into wider land and seascapes	No data available is the biggest challenge that stop from integrating protected areas into the wider land/seascapes	No spatial assessment conducted on these sectors (agriculture, waste pollution, sedimentation, tourism, etc)	A spatial assessment of these sectors (agriculture, waste pollution, sedimentation, tourism, etc) can help provide better understanding of the benefits and threats they pose to the sustainability of the land/seascapes	To conduct a spatial assessment of these sectors (agriculture, waste pollution, sedimentation, tourism, etc) can help provide better understanding of the benefits and threats they pose to the sustainability of the land/seascapes
Other effective area based conservation measures	Conservation area  LMMA	Confusion on the terminology used between Protected area and the Managed Marine Area	Communities need to fully understand and differentiate the two terminology	Communities need to clarify the language used regarding the different types of designated areas (conservation areas), clearly separating the roles of MPAs as no take zone from MMAs.
Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Chelonian mydas</i></li> <li>- <i>Dermochelys coriacea</i></li> <li>- <i>Emoia adspersa</i></li> <li>- <i>Bristle-thighed Curlew</i></li> </ul>	<p>No current study show the status population of our endemic species, <i>Lepidodactylus tepukapili</i></p> <p>Need a stock assessment on clam and commercial cucumber especially in Funafuti</p>	Terrestrial and Marine BioRAP survey	To conduct a BioRAP survey on both terrestrial and marine

Element of Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
Conservation status of species in declined is improved	Clams, healthy coral communities and other reef fishes such as Parrot fishes, <i>Naso lituratus</i> are more abundant in the conservation area compare to outside area	No long-term reef monitoring for both the conservation area and outside area  Lack of capacity on reef monitoring	Establish a management plan for the conservation area on each island  Set up management committee on each island  Train members of the committees on survey techniques	Each island need to establish management plans for their managed marine areas

### 11. Vanuatu

Element of Aichi Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
<b>Target 11</b> Quantitative elements: Terrestrial and Marine	<u>TERRESTRIAL:</u> 4 Gazetted sites total area: 6,520 ha  <u>MARINE</u> 2 Gazetted sites Total area: 840 ha  A total of 39 unregistered site and boundaries and areas not calculated (information provided by NBSAP revision consultations).	Extension of mangrove and sea grass conservation areas.  Information gap on terrestrial and marine national targets to achieve the global target.  Need more awareness about protected area  There needs to be an effective monitoring program to ensure biodiversity is protected and improved.	To develop a national mangrove initiative to build on MESCAL project.  Partners' support –information database improvement (BIOPAMA/SPREP). GEF 4 – to gazette 3 more PAs. GEF 5 – build on remaining PA activities of GEF 4. UNDP Cross Cutting Capacity Development Project (national data and information management system for MEAs). GEF 6 capacity building for national PAs.	Promotion and awareness campaign for communities to gain interest in conservation areas.  Increase engagement of the fisheries sector.  To develop a clear national strategy to establish marine protected areas.  Conduct biodiversity valuation and cost benefit analysis of biodiversity and ecosystems for both marine and terrestrial.

Element of Aichi Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
Ecological representativeness	An atlas with key biodiversity information layers is under preparation with emphasis on coastal marine areas, terrestrial areas will need to be added.	Marine -unidentified priority areas such as underwater habitats and spatial planning. Terrestrial areas will need to be included in the atlas. International Bird Areas (IBA) – confirm the 27 KBAs.	MACBIO – create the layers for Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), Alliance for Zero Extinction Sites (AZEs), IBAs and wetland sites and areas important for ecosystem services to show overlap with existing gazetted conservation areas.	Create a strategic picture (map).
<p>Areas important for biodiversity</p> <p>Areas important for ecosystem services</p>	<p>27 KBAs and 6 are priority sites for Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF). AZEs – are found on Vanua lava, Mota Lava. Provisional IBAs are 15 and 7 confirmed. These are Vathe Conservation Area on Santo, Mt Sereana at Vanua Lava, Tongoa Island, Santo Mountain Chain, Loru Protected Area, North Ambrym and Ambae. Turtle feeding and nesting sites.</p> <p>13 national wetland priority sites.</p> <p>Marine – ecosystem services studied provides information on key ecosystems and services.</p>	<p>Marine priority KBAs</p> <p>Terrestrial ecosystem service assessments required.</p>	<p>GEF 6 funding</p> <p>Terrestrial – useful information is available but needs to be collected and collated.</p>	<p>Work is needed to confirm other proposed IBAs.</p> <p>Revised NBSAP to include the 27 KBAs, IBAs and the priority wetland sites.</p> <p>Revised NBSAP to also include turtle nesting and feeding sites and marine priority areas.</p> <p>Assess and identify important watershed/water catchment areas.</p> <p>Carry out biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.</p>

Element of Aichi Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
<p>Management effectiveness assessment(s)</p> <p>Improvement(s)</p>	<p>Gazetted Conservation Areas submit annual report as part of monitoring of their management plan implementation.</p>	<p>Monitoring of results for ecological quality.</p> <p>Understanding of the methodologies.</p> <p>Basic wildlife biological information.</p>	<p>Approach relevant partners for technical support.</p> <p>Assess suitable management effectiveness tools and how they could be adapted for using in Vanuatu.</p>	<p>Developing simple and relevant guides to build capacity in environmental monitoring for PA local management committees.</p> <p>Funding for regular management committee meetings. Resources and skills are needed to make this event to regularly happening.</p> <p>Create a list of the main capacity building needs.</p>
	<p><b>GOVERNANCE:</b> Environmental Protection and Conservation (EPC) Act – CAP 283.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal provision for community conservation areas.</li> <li>- Investors who leased land areas and have them as conservation areas also use EPC Act for legal recognition.</li> <li>- National Parks Act but it only allows communities to have the areas be legally recognized. The community will still manage it and not managed by the government. Again this is due to land tenure</li> </ul>	<p>National parks Act does not allow an area to be managed by the government as a national park. This is due to land tenure system.</p>	<p>GEF 5 and 6 to consider review of the existing legislations to allow for implementation</p>	<p>To review existing EPC Act and National Parks Act to adequately address national relevant PA governance systems (community governance and government governance).</p>

Element of Aichi Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
	<p>system.</p> <p><b>EQUITY:</b>                      Management plan development involves the community using a management plan template that also includes governance structure and equity matrix.</p> <p>Equity matrix indicates how the income benefits are shared among the management committee and the landowners and communities.</p> <p>Ecosystem services, ecotourism, food security.</p>	<p>Ecosystem services assessment needed for terrestrial PAs.</p>		
Connectivity and corridors	Marine – data have been collated and mapped.	Lack of similar terrestrial efforts.	GEF 6 – Review of existing areas of biodiversity importance. - Preliminary technical studies for potential islands connectivity	Focus on formally protected areas initially.
Integration into wider land and seascapes	<p>Marine –some progress is in place including final draft ocean policy.</p> <p>Terrestrial – some progress the national sustainable plans and other relevant policies including the overarching productive sector policy in</p>	Preliminary technical reviews and assessments required.	GEF 5 and 6 Sustainable plans and policies and their targets and indicators give strong justification to achieve these elements.  Commonwealth “Blue Economy”.	GEF 5 implementation and GEF 6 planning  Priority action – continues to support the agriculture with best practices guidance and techniques and protects biodiversity and water catchment areas management. Draft fisheries policy.

Element of Aichi Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
	place now provide solid platform to achieve this element.			
Other effective area based conservation measures	Good record of informal areas is underway. (Traditionally managed areas for both marine and terrestrial).	Traditionally managed areas need to be mapped and inventoried to measure their effectiveness.	More tools are available to measure effectiveness.	Areas being managed for special interests need to be better described and demarcated.
<b>Target 12</b> Extinction of known threatened species is prevented	<p>Focus on 13 priority species (2 critically endangered and 11 endangered species).</p> <p>Plants: 10 species – <i>Carpoxyonmacrosperrum</i> (CR), <i>Agathatmacrophylla</i> (E), <i>Cyphospermavoutmelensis</i> (E), <i>Veitchiamontgomeryana</i> (E).</p> <p>Turtles: 2 species – <i>Eretmochelysimbricata</i> (CR) and <i>Cheloniamydas</i> (E).</p> <p>Skinks: 2 species – <i>Emoiaaneityumensis</i> (E). Fruit Bats: 3 species – <i>Pteropusfundatus</i> (E) Insectivorous Bat: 3 species – <i>Chaerephonbregullae</i>(E),</p>	<p>Lack of information on population status and trend on birds.</p> <p>Bats – some information available (Tim Flannery work and Santo 2006 expedition) Some plant information available at the national herbarium.</p>	<p>Bat conservation international CEPF Grant Scheme</p> <p>Some coconut crab information available through UNDP small grant projects and department of fisheries, to further that work through UNDP small grant.</p>	<p>Risk Extinction Assessment. Population Status assessment of threatened species (animals and plants). To develop species recovery and management plan. Community plans for sustainable harvest (megapode, turtles, petrels, fruit bats, etc). Review coconut crab harvesting systems (quotas, close season).</p> <p>Those key actions will also be addressed in the revised NBSAP</p>

Element of Aichi Targets 11 and 12	Status	Gaps	Opportunities	Priority actions
	<p><i>Emballonurasemicaudata</i> (E).                      Birds: 9 species -  <i>Alopecoenassanctaerucis</i> (E),  <i>Nesofregettafuliginosa</i> (E)</p>			
<p>Conservation status of species in declined is improved</p>	<p>Some work has commenced at national level to draft specified species (endemic, rare, over exploited specific species and threatened species) regulation to control harvest, export and captive keeping. This work includes a list or schedule of all threatened and other significant species.</p>	<p>To include CITES appendix 1 species so to completely ban its trading.</p>	<p>GEF 6 fund                      Department of Environment’s initiative in completing the regulation.                      UNDP cross cutting capacity (ccd) project will develop information management system for all MEAs which will include data on threatened species.                      CEPF grant scheme.</p>	<p>To develop species recovery and management plan for the critical endangered species. (This plan should be part of the PAs management plans where the species exist).                      To continue the process for developing and finalize the specified species regulation.                      To include threatened species in the UNDP cccd project for data management system.</p>

## Annex IV

## NEEDS FOR ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS 11 AND 12

Equity and governance	Research	Regional cooperation	(Data Management)	Connectivity	Financial resources	Effectiveness (management / performance)	Capacity development (professional / skills / competency)	Communication and awareness	Integration into wider landscapes and seascapes	Other
	Legislation/-policy		Technical guidance	Trans-boundary conservation						
Technical review of management effectiveness of current PAs	Develop PA legislation	Respect and align to national priorities under NBSAPs	Pacific focal point for data to feed to WDPA	Sustainable sourcing of supply chains	Funds to sustainably finance PA network (terrestrial and marine)	Determination of “sustainable actions” in identified areas under BIORAP (different areas)	Capacity (technical and financial) to develop, use and manage a PA database	Contact information	Integrating PAs and agriculture in production landscapes	Economic evaluation of PAs to help us convince leaders to prioritize biodiversity
Private sector investment into PA governance and management	Protected area law followed and enforced	Project aligned to NBSAP priorities	Systematic and scientific monitoring of protected areas	Micronesian challenge - case study for other regions	Economic valuation of multiple benefits PAs and use this to advocate for national Governments to integrate into national budgets	Commitment to put priorities into action to deliver measurable responses	Capacity to analyse data collected; capacity to assess management effectiveness	Streamlining of information	Tools for integrating biodiversity into spatial plans	Facilitate cost benefit analysis on biodiversity projects
Documenting effective PA management systems for formal recognition	Identify policy overlap for conservation	Partnership with various agencies (e.g. WDPA)	GIS, spatial mapping and analysis	Establishment of R2R (Reef to Ridge) corridors	Lack of funding	Lack of knowledge about economic valuation of PAs	Capacity to collect comprehensive PA site data to better inform management plans	Strategic advocacy / communication to decision makers	Developed land use plans	Best practice guidelines for ecotourism, for benefit of community and SP
Evidence of	Limited	National	Establish		Support for	Application of	Local pool of	Document	Ecological	Economic value

Equity and governance	Research	Regional cooperation	(Data Management)	Connectivity	Financial resources	Effectiveness (management / performance)	Capacity development (professional / skills / competency)	Communication and awareness	Integration into wider landscapes and seascapes	Other
	Legislation/-policy		Technical guidance	Trans-boundary conservation						
implementation of benefit-sharing arrangements	information and data from inaccessible sites (e.g. Uplands)	level PA status and monitoring to be a core function and support of SPREP	national hub for marine data / information		community-managed PAs or LMMAs to be a funding priority; tech support at country and regional	Green List to improve performance	experts on PA management	information about PAs to support priority sites	information (components, processes, connectivity)	on wetlands conservation area to promote political will on the part of the government
Develop national guidance for establishing different PA systems		Recognition of OECMs, LMMAs at global / IUCN level as a PA category	Improve baseline information at site and national level – and update periodically		Ecosystem services should be recognized as national income, an expenditure stream, as part of national annual budget	Need management effectiveness tools / capacity guidelines	Capacity to carry out data collection / research on islands	Reporting framework for Aichi Targets 11 and 12	Conduct national biodiversity assessments (marine / terrestrial) à SOE, BIORAP	Strong coaching for all aspects of PAs implementation on-the-ground
Standardize best practices for co-management of PAs		Better collaboration between RFMOs and international conventions for species protection (e.g. CITES and CMS)	Capacity-building – training on developing PA management plan and land use guidelines for the various types of PAs under the IUCN categories		Sustaining financing mechanisms developed		Conduct economic valuation for protected areas, used for: government; communities; and other sectors	The need to know and understand the PAs at Divisional level (PAs and its management)	National land use policy framework adopted	Developing management plans; implementation governance and participation; assist with alternative incomes and management of landscape to reduce pressures
Training, regarding governance			Review spatial definition of coastal and marine areas		Accessing funds from national financial institutions		Training on GEF proposal writing	National awareness strategies and implementation	Integrate MSP and land use planning	
			A better set of				Support		Inter-agency	

Equity and governance	Research	Regional cooperation	(Data Management)	Connectivity	Financial resources	Effectiveness (management / performance)	Capacity development (professional / skills / competency)	Communication and awareness	Integration into wider landscapes and seascapes	Other
	Legislation/-policy		Technical guidance	Trans-boundary conservation						
			baseline PA information							
			Formidable information system – database						Sustainable land / forest management in PA margins	
			Information on how best to implement zero-loss as part of mitigation measures							

\_\_\_\_\_